

OXFORD CLASSICAL MONOGRAPHS

# The Early Latin Verb System

*Archaic Forms in Plautus, Terence, and Beyond*

Wolfgang David Cirilo de Melo



Atis iam. satis. simo. spectata erga te amicitia est mea.

Satis periculi incepti adire. orandi iam finem face.

OXFORD CLASSICAL MONOGRAPHS

*Published under the supervision of a Committee of the  
Faculty of Classics in the University of Oxford*

The aim of the Oxford Classical Monograph series (which replaces the Oxford Classical and Philosophical Monographs) is to publish books based on the best theses on Greek and Latin literature, ancient history, and ancient philosophy examined by the Faculty Board of Classics.

# The Early Latin Verb System

*Archaic Forms in Plautus, Terence,  
and Beyond*

WOLFGANG DAVID CIRILO DE MELO

OXFORD  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

# OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford ox2 6dp

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.  
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,  
and education by publishing worldwide in

Oxford New York

Auckland Cape Town Dar es Salaam Hong Kong Karachi

Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Nairobi

New Delhi Shanghai Taipei Toronto

With offices in

Argentina Austria Brazil Chile Czech Republic France Greece

Guatemala Hungary Italy Japan Poland Portugal Singapore

South Korea Switzerland Thailand Turkey Ukraine Vietnam

Oxford is a registered trade mark of Oxford University Press  
in the UK and in certain other countries

Published in the United States  
by Oxford University Press Inc., New York

© Wolfgang David Cirilo de Melo 2007

The moral rights of the author have been asserted

Database right Oxford University Press (maker)

First published 2007

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,  
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,  
without the prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press,  
or as expressly permitted by law, or under terms agreed with the appropriate  
reprographics rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction  
outside the scope of the above should be sent to the Rights Department,  
Oxford University Press, at the address above

You must not circulate this book in any other binding or cover  
and you must impose the same condition on any acquirer

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Data available

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Data available

Typeset by SPI Publisher Services, Pondicherry, India

Printed in Great Britain

on acid-free paper by

Biddles Ltd., King's Lynn, Norfolk

ISBN 978-0-19-920902-6

1 3 5 7 9 10 8 6 4 2

*For my parents and my brother*

*This page intentionally left blank*

## Preface

THIS book began as an essay I wrote as an M.Phil. student at Oxford. It dealt with verb forms like *faxō* and ended with the statement that a number of problems remain. The essay was subsequently turned into an M.Phil. thesis, and the M.Phil. into a D.Phil. (de Melo 2004*b*). Now, a few years after the original essay, there are still a number of remaining problems. However, at some stage one has to stop and move on.

Moving on was made easier by the fact that I think I have reached conclusions which are of interest to various groups of readers. I set out to write this book because I found the treatment of extra-paradigmatic verb forms in manuals and scholarly articles deeply unsatisfactory. Such forms, for instance *faxō*, *faxim*, *impetrāssere*, *duim*, or *attigās*, are at the heart of the book, which provides their first comprehensive treatment both synchronically and diachronically. I have always held the view that these forms can only be understood if we compare their usage with that of the 'standard' forms. Since not even these 'standard' forms had been given sufficient attention in the literature, I decided to discuss aspects of their use in the first part of my book. As I am comparing archaic usage with classical usage throughout this first part, I hope that it will be of interest not only to those working on Archaic Latin texts, but also to scholars of Classical Latin. In the second part, I deal with the extra-paradigmatic verb forms found in Archaic Latin. I examine their frequency, register, temporal and aspectual functions, and distribution over the various clause types. This second part ought to be useful especially for those working on Archaic Latin, whether they are more interested in language or in literature. The third part of the book looks at the origins of the extra-paradigmatic forms and their survival in the classical and post-classical language. As such, it could help historical linguists and scholars of Latin literature; the former might be particularly interested in the Proto-Italic and Indo-European origins of the forms, while the latter will probably want to know what to make of such archaic forms when they turn up in late texts.

Numerous people have helped me to improve the book. My theses were jointly supervised by two true scholars, John Penney and Anna Morpurgo Davies. Both of them gave me generously of their time, saved me from small and great errors, and encouraged me whenever the burden of writing my dissertations seemed overwhelming. I owe them far more than I can express in these few words. Special thanks are due to Greg Kochanski. He explained to me a number of statistical techniques and their uses with great patience. Peter Brown answered my last-minute questions on Plautine metre. Donald Russell was not directly involved in this book, but gave me a better understanding of metre and style by teaching me how to write Latin and Greek verse. His kindness and calmness together with his immense learning made him my great example during my years at Oxford. Tobias Reinhardt gave me the opportunity to work for Somerville College and, when I was too busy writing, even helped me to look for jobs. I was lucky enough to be examined by two of the world's greatest experts on Latin, Harm Pinkster and James Adams. Both of them suggested ways how I could improve my thesis. James Adams also helped me very generously when I was turning the thesis into a book. Without him, the book would never have become what it is; on many occasions, his critical acumen and sound judgement prevented me from going astray. Enid Barker gave me useful comments on layout and presentation. Leofranc Holford-Strevens went through the entire typescript and discussed various issues with me, from layout to matters of content. Rolando Ferri helped me with register and politeness. Peter Kruschwitz gave me material on the ancient grammarians' treatment of metre. Finally, Östen Dahl, Lyle Campbell, and Scott DeLancey discussed AcI constructions with me.

If it were customary to express one's gratitude towards scholars who died before our time, I should thank Gonzalez Lodge. In this book, I occasionally point out one or the other mistake he made. Nevertheless, it is fair to say that I could not have written it without his monumental *Lexicon Plautinum*.

I gratefully acknowledge the financial support I received from a scholarship of the Bavarian State (Stipendium gemäß dem Bayerischen Begabtenförderungsgesetz), a scholarship of the Franz-Marie-Christinen-Stiftung, a Senior Scholarship at Corpus Christi College, a Vice-Chancellors' Fund Award, a Charles Oldham Grant,

and a Special Scholarship of the Committee for Comparative Philology, Linguistics, and Phonetics. Various travel grants from the Università degli Studi di Urbino, Corpus Christi College, and the Committee for Comparative Philology, Linguistics, and Phonetics enabled me to attend conferences in Amsterdam, Urbino, and Bologna. I should like to thank the anonymous committees that gave me the Chancellor's Latin Verse Prize, the Chancellor's Latin Prose Prize, the Gaisford Prize for Greek Verse (jointly), and the Gaisford Dissertation Prize (jointly). The latter was for my 2002*b* article, which forms the basis of Ch. 6. I am particularly grateful to the anonymous committee that awarded me (jointly) the Conington Prize for my D.Phil. thesis.

When I was writing my theses, many friends made sure that I stayed sane, at least most of the time; I can only mention a few: Johannes Salomon, Julian Borthwick, Lars Larm, Panagiotis Filos, Justine Wolfenden, Roozbeh Arianpour, Nicholas Pierpan, Robert Evans, and Rene McGraw. When I was turning my D.Phil. into a book, Sally Chingyi Kung encouraged me every day.

I dedicate this book to my parents and my brother. My parents and my brother have given me more support than anyone else. Their advice has been invaluable throughout my life, but never more so than while I was writing my theses and my book. Especially in the final stages, my brother also helped me to solve any computer problems that arose.

Sī quid in hōc librō poteris reperīre lepōris,  
illōs auxiliō nōsce fuisse mihī.  
Sīn autem multum peccāre uidēbor ubīque,  
nīl tribuās illis; crimina nostra legis.

W. D. C. d. M.

*This page intentionally left blank*

# Contents

|                                   |      |
|-----------------------------------|------|
| <i>List of Tables</i>             | xiv  |
| <i>Abbreviations and Editions</i> | xvii |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 1. Introduction: An Archaic Verb System?      | 1  |
| The Regular Forms                             | 3  |
| The Extra-Paradigmatic Types in Archaic Latin | 4  |
| The Diachronic Side                           | 12 |
| Data and Methodology                          | 12 |

## PART I. FOUR PROBLEMS IN THE LATIN VERB SYSTEM

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Introduction to Part I  | 19  |
| 2. Simple Future and Future Perfect in Archaic Latin  | 21  |
| Possible Contrasts between Simple Future and Future<br>Perfect  | 24  |
| The Regular Future Forms in Three Plays   | 35  |
| Conclusions   | 49  |
| 3. The Sequence of Tenses in Archaic Latin  | 51  |
| The Sequence Rules in More Detail   | 57  |
| Subordinate Clauses with Independent Subjunctives   | 77  |
| Some Statistics   | 87  |
| Conclusions   | 89  |
| 4. Prohibitions with <i>fēcerīs</i> and <i>faciās</i> in Archaic Latin  | 92  |
| Prohibitions with <i>nē</i> ( <i>nēue</i> ), <i>minimē</i> , <i>nēmō</i> , <i>neque</i> ( <i>nec</i> ),<br><i>nihil</i> , and <i>nūllus</i> | 99  |
| Prohibitions with Forms of <i>cauēre</i>  | 119 |
| Conclusions   | 129 |
| 5. Infinitivals with Future Meaning in Archaic Latin  | 133 |
| Telicity  | 137 |
| The Subject of the Infinitive   | 144 |

|                                     |     |
|-------------------------------------|-----|
| The Infinitive <i>dare</i>          | 146 |
| The Voice of the Infinitive         | 148 |
| Subject Accusatives                 | 149 |
| Register Differences                | 154 |
| The Influence of the Governing Verb | 158 |
| Diachronic Differences              | 161 |
| Conclusions                         | 162 |

## PART II. THE EXTRA-PARADIGMATIC VERB FORMS: A SYNCHRONIC ANALYSIS

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Introduction to Part II   | 169 |
| 6. The Sigmatic Future in Archaic Latin   | 171 |
| The Sigmatic Forms in Subordinate Clauses   | 174 |
| The Sigmatic Forms in Main Clauses  | 180 |
| A Rationale for the Distribution of the Sigmatic<br>Indicative Forms?                   | 188 |
| Conclusions   | 189 |
| 7. The Sigmatic Subjunctive in Archaic Latin  | 191 |
| Frequency and Productivity  | 192 |
| Register  | 195 |
| Combination with Other Tenses, Time Reference, and<br>Other Features                    | 199 |
| Distribution Patterns   | 209 |
| Conclusions   | 213 |
| Excursus: The Rhotacized Forms <i>iūuerint</i> , <i>monērint</i> ,<br>and <i>sīrint</i> | 215 |
| 8. The Sigmatic Infinitives   | 224 |
| Productivity and Register   | 225 |
| Time Reference and Function   | 226 |
| Conclusions   | 238 |
| 9. The Type <i>duim</i> in Archaic Latin  | 240 |
| Frequency and Productivity  | 242 |
| Register  | 246 |
| Tense, Aspect, and Other Features   | 248 |
| Patterns of Distribution  | 255 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Conclusions   | 260 |
| An Addendum: The Indicative Forms in Archaic Latin  | 261 |
| 10. The Type <i>attigās</i> in Archaic Latin        | 264 |
| Frequency and Productivity                          | 266 |
| Register  | 277 |
| Temporal Reference and Special Features             | 279 |
| Distribution over Clause Types                      | 290 |
| Conclusions   | 295 |
| A Further Addendum: Extra-Paradigmatic Indicatives? | 296 |

### PART III. THE EXTRA-PARADIGMATIC VERB FORMS: A DIACHRONIC ANALYSIS

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Introduction to Part III                                       | 303 |
| 11. Some Problems of Reconstruction                            | 305 |
| Aorists or Desideratives?                                      | 306 |
| The Origin of the -ss- in <i>amāssint</i>                      | 315 |
| Ancient and Recent Sigmatic Forms                              | 321 |
| Some Problems Concerning <i>duim</i> and <i>dem</i>            | 327 |
| Summary  | 335 |
| 12. Extra-Paradigmatic Forms in Classical and Later Latin      | 336 |
| The Sigmatic Indicatives and Subjunctives                      | 338 |
| Rhotacized Forms and Sigmatic Infinitives                      | 353 |
| The <i>ī</i> -Subjunctives and Their Corresponding Indicatives | 354 |
| The Extra-Paradigmatic <i>ā</i> -Subjunctives                  | 358 |
| Conclusions  | 362 |

### PART IV. A BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS

|                          |     |
|--------------------------|-----|
| Summary                  | 367 |
| <i>References</i>        | 376 |
| <i>Index of Passages</i> | 391 |
| <i>Index of Words</i>    | 397 |
| <i>General Index</i>     | 406 |

## *List of Tables*

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 2.1. The tenses of the <i>īnfectum</i> and <i>perfectum</i> stems                               | 22  |
| 2.2. The absolute and relative tenses of the Latin active indicative                            | 28  |
| 2.3. Simple futures and future perfects in main and subordinate clauses                         | 34  |
| 2.4. The distribution of future tenses in <i>Aul.</i> and <i>Curc.</i>                          | 36  |
| 2.5. The distribution of future tenses in <i>Ad.</i>  | 37  |
| 2.6. Simple futures and future perfects of <i>īre</i> and some of its compounds in main clauses | 44  |
| 3.1. The <i>cōnsecūtiō temporum</i> of the Latin active subjunctive                             | 52  |
| 3.2. Subjunctives in subordinate clauses in <i>Aul.</i> , <i>Curc.</i> , and <i>Ad.</i>         | 55  |
| 3.3. <i>Potentiālis</i> and <i>irreālis</i> in Classical Latin                                  | 71  |
| 3.4. <i>Potentiālis</i> and <i>irreālis</i> in Archaic Latin                                    | 73  |
| 3.5. Present and imperfect subjunctives in indirect questions and <i>quīn</i> -clauses          | 87  |
| 3.6. Clauses with and without backshift in past contexts  | 88  |
| 3.7. Clauses with regular and with irregular sequence   | 89  |
| 4.1. The present subjunctive versus the present imperative and the perfect subjunctive          | 104 |
| 4.2. Prohibitions with negatives other than <i>cauē</i>   | 105 |
| 4.3. The constructions of <i>cauē</i> without <i>nē</i>   | 122 |
| 5.1. ACIs with present and future reference: telic and atelic events                            | 139 |
| 5.2. ACIs with future reference: telic and atelic events  | 141 |
| 5.3. Telicity, time reference, and frequency in pre-Latin infinitivals                          | 143 |
| 5.4. Tenses and the subjects of the infinitives   | 144 |
| 5.5. Tenses of telic ACIs and the subjects of the infinitives                                   | 145 |
| 5.6. The correlation between present and future reference and the subjects                      | 146 |
| 5.7. <i>Dare</i> : infinitives with future reference  | 147 |
| 5.8. Voice and tense in ACIs  | 149 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 5.9. Presence and absence of pronominal subject accusatives in cantica and senarii   | 151 |
| 5.10. Subject accusatives and tenses   | 153 |
| 5.11. AcIs in Plautus: cantica and senarii   | 156 |
| 5.12. AcIs with future meaning: the two groups   | 160 |
| 5.13. A classification of AcIs with future reference: the two groups   | 160 |
| 5.14. The diachronic decline of the present infinitive with future meaning   | 161 |
| 6.1. Sigmatic futures in subordinate and main clauses in Plautus and Terence: tokens   | 172 |
| 6.2. Sigmatic futures in subordinate and main clauses in Plautus and Terence: types  | 173 |
| 6.3. Sigmatic futures and future perfects in subordinate clauses in Plautus  | 179 |
| 6.4. The frequencies of causative <i>faciam</i> in Plautus and Terence   | 187 |
| 7.1. The productivity of sigmatic subjunctives in main and subordinate clauses   | 193 |
| 7.2. Sigmatic versus regular subjunctives in Plautus: verbs  | 194 |
| 7.3. The distribution of subjunctives over main clause types in Plautus  | 210 |
| 7.4. The distribution of subjunctives over main clause types in Terence  | 211 |
| 7.5. The distribution of forms over subordinate clause types   | 212 |
| 9.1. The proportion of <i>ī</i> -forms in main and subordinate clauses   | 243 |
| 9.2. The distribution of <i>ī</i> -forms and regular subjunctives in Plautus: verbs  | 244 |
| 9.3. The distribution of forms over main clause types in Plautus   | 256 |
| 9.4. The distribution of forms over main clause types in Terence   | 257 |
| 9.5. The distribution of forms over subordinate clause types in Plautus  | 258 |
| 9.6. The distribution of present subjunctives, perfect/sigmatic subjunctives, and <i>ī</i> -forms in prohibitions in Plautus and Terence | 259 |
| 10.1. Extra-paradigmatic <i>ā</i> -forms and regular subjunctives in main and subordinate clauses  | 268 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 10.2. Irregular and regular subjunctives of <i>accrēdere</i> , <i>crēdere</i> , and <i>dare</i> in Plautus     | 270 |
| 10.3. Irregular and regular subjunctives of <i>deesse</i> and <i>esse</i> in Plautus                           | 271 |
| 10.4. Irregular and regular subjunctives of <i>aduenīre</i> , <i>ēuenīre</i> , and <i>peruenīre</i> in Plautus | 274 |
| 10.5. The distribution of forms over main clauses in Plautus   | 292 |
| 10.6. The distribution of forms over main clauses in Terence   | 293 |
| 10.7. The distribution of forms over subordinate clauses in Plautus  | 293 |
| 10.8. The various forms in prohibitions in Plautus and Terence   | 294 |
| 12.1. The sigmatic subjunctives of <i>audēre</i> in poetry and prose   | 343 |
| 12.2. The usage of <i>fuā-</i> in prose and verse  | 359 |

## *Abbreviations and Editions*

- BTL*     *Bibliotheca Teubneriana Latina (BTL)*, CD-ROM, 2nd edn. (Munich and Leipzig, 2002)
- CGL*     G. Goetz and G. Loewe, *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*, 7 vols. (Leipzig and Berlin, 1888–1923)
- H–S*     J. B. Hofmann and A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik* (Munich, 1965)
- K–St*     R. Kühner and C. Stegmann, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*, 4th edn. (rev. A. Thierfelder), 2 vols. (Darmstadt, 1962)
- LLF*     M. Leumann, *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*, 6th edn. (Munich, 1977)
- LIV*     H. Rix, M. Kümmel, Th. Zehnder, R. Lipp, and B. Schirmer, *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben: Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstamm-bildungen*, 2nd edn. (Wiesbaden, 2001)
- L–S*     C. T. Lewis and C. Short, *A Latin Dictionary* (Oxford, 1879)
- OLD*     *The Oxford Latin Dictionary* (Oxford, 1996)
- TLL*     *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (Leipzig, 1900–)

All other modern works are quoted according to the author–date system. Wherever possible, I cite Latin texts in accordance with the norms set out in *TLL*, but since so much of my data comes from Plautus and Terence, I usually quote their plays without reference to the authors. Thus I write for example *Cas.* 531 and not *Plaut. Cas.* 531. For the fragments of early tragedy and comedy I cite according to Ribbeck’s second edition (1871–3) because it is probably more readily available to most of my readers than the third. Certain texts are normally cited by page number. For Ausonius I use Green’s edition (1994), but Peiper’s reference system (1886). Festus and Paul the Deacon are quoted from Lindsay (1913), and the page numbers are his rather than those from Müller, which are also given by Lindsay. I use Lindsay’s text (1903) for Nonius; the page numbers are Lindsay’s, but the line numbers are Müller’s, which are again

provided by Lindsay. For Claudianus Mamertus I used Engelbrecht's edition (1885), for Fronto van den Hout's second (1988), for most grammarians Hertz/Keil (1855–70), and for Servius and the glosses on Virgil Thilo and Hagen (1878–1902).<sup>1</sup> My Sabellic and Faliscan material comes from Rix (2002) and Vetter (1953), respectively; I follow their systems of transliteration and also their abbreviations.

<sup>1</sup> The Harvard Servius does not give any new insights into the few passages relevant to this book.

## Introduction: An Archaic Verb System?

Dicēbant antīquī ‘sī iussō’, id est ‘iusserō’. ...Nōn id agō nunc hāc diligentīā ut ostendam quantum tempus apud grammaticum perdiderim. (Sen. *epist.* 58. 4–5.)

The ancients used to say *sī iussō* (‘if I shall have ordered’); this means *iusserō* (‘I shall have ordered’). ...I am not dealing with this now in order to show how much time I wasted with my grammar teacher.

ONE does not have to be a linguist in order to notice changes in one’s language. It is equally easy to observe how a number of people put up fierce resistance to any such changes until they become widespread enough to enter the grammar books.<sup>1</sup> Once the old forms or constructions have been ousted from the spoken language, they may be taught as archaisms at school. The old future *iussō* ‘I shall have ordered’ underwent this process as well. We find such a future *iussit* ‘he will have ordered’ in the *lex Silia* (3rd c. BC), and Virgil employs *iussō* as an archaism (*Aen.* 11. 467). Later on, in Seneca’s time, such forms were learnt at school, not always to the pupils’ delight.

The changes that are perhaps noticed most readily by the average native speaker are the morphological ones. Not all of them are equally important; some only involve the outward shape of words, but leave the morphological system intact, while others affect the system itself. To give an example of a superficial change, we find verb forms like *loquier* ‘to speak’ and *forēt* ‘he would be’ in Archaic Latin (roughly

<sup>1</sup> For the Romans’ awareness of and their attitudes towards linguistic change see Müller (2002: 263–71).

until 100 BC). *Loquier* has an old ending and *forēt* has an old stem. The Ciceronian equivalents are *loquī* and *esset*. The fact that these old forms can easily be ‘translated’ into more modern ones does not speak for a change in the language as a system.

Other archaic verb forms cannot simply be given classical equivalents. This is the case for forms like *faxō* (from *facere* ‘to do’), *duim* (from *dare* ‘to give’), or *attigās* (from *attingere* ‘to touch’). What all of these ‘extra-paradigmatic’ forms have in common is that they do not fit into the classical verbal paradigm based on two stems (*īnfectum* and *perfectum*) with three tenses each. Since most of them die out before the classical period (around 100 BC–AD 50), classicists tend to dismiss them as irrelevant archaisms. In doing so, they follow a time-honoured tradition, as we can see from the quotation of Seneca above. Philologists, by contrast, normally assert that such forms are important. In practice, however, they all too often merely give them Indo-European labels like ‘s-desideratives’ without worrying about their synchronic meanings or their syntactic and semantic functions in the Archaic Latin and pre-Latin verbal systems.<sup>2</sup> But these are the forms that can tell us whether the verbal system as such changed. Has Archaic Latin a system that differs in essential points from that of Classical Latin, or does it at least display traces of such an earlier system?

In this book, it is my aim to discuss three questions relevant to the verbal system of Archaic Latin. Firstly, to what extent does the use of the ‘regular’ forms in Archaic Latin correspond to their use in Classical Latin, and to what extent does it differ? Secondly, and most importantly, how are the extra-paradigmatic forms employed in Archaic Latin? Do they fit into the patterns provided by the regular forms? And thirdly, what are the origins of the extra-paradigmatic forms and how do they survive in later Latin? In the remainder of this chapter, I shall elaborate on these three problems and outline how I am trying to solve them in the chapters to follow; I shall also address some issues concerning the collection of data and other technicalities.

<sup>2</sup> The fact that the forms do not fit into the morphological paradigm does not necessarily imply that they do not have a role to play in the syntax and semantics or pragmatics of the verbal system which is comparable to that of the regular forms.

## THE REGULAR FORMS

The fact that the regular forms have the same morphology in Archaic and Classical Latin obviously does not entail that they are employed in the same ways. In fact, it would be strange if there were no differences at all between Archaic and Classical Latin. The standard grammars like Bennett (1910) or H-S discuss most of these problems thoroughly, but unfortunately not all of them. I cannot tackle all the remaining problems here, but will pay special attention to those spheres of usage that will again be relevant when I turn to the extra-paradigmatic forms. In particular, the following four questions have not been answered satisfactorily in the standard grammars:

1. Is there a contrast between simple future and future perfect in Archaic Latin, and if so, what is it? This is important for my discussion of sigmatic futures, whose semantic values can be described by comparing them with these regular tenses (Ch. 6).
2. Are there rules for the sequence of tenses in Archaic Latin, and if so, how do they differ from the classical ones? This matters for extra-paradigmatic subjunctives in subordinate clauses (Chs. 7, 9, and 10); their meaning is partly determined by the sequence rules here.
3. What is the distinction between the prohibitive expressions *nē faciās* and *nē fecerīs* (both roughly meaning 'don't do') in Archaic Latin? The answer will again be useful in Chs. 7, 9, and 10, where I am discussing the extra-paradigmatic subjunctives. Many of these forms occur in prohibitive sentences.
4. Under what circumstances can the present tense infinitive be used in the accusative and infinitive with future reference? The answer to this question will be relevant in Ch. 8, where I turn to the sigmatic infinitives, most of which occur in this construction with future reference.

I shall address these questions in Part I (Chs. 2–5). The answers that I shall give may come as a surprise to those used to the theories in Bennett (1910) or H-S. The simple future is employed as a future tense without regard to perfective or imperfective aspect, and the future perfect stands for anterior, completed events, again without

regard to distinctions of perfectivity. The standard theories state that the difference between the two tenses is mainly aspectual, but they will be shown to be untenable. The sequence rules are basically the same as those of Classical Latin, which is again unexpected because Lindsay (1907: 56) claims that there is a great deal of random variation. No aspectual distinctions can be found between the types *nē faciās* and *nē fēcerīs*; I shall argue that *nē fēcerīs* is a survival of earlier aspectual meanings of the perfect subjunctive, but that this use of the perfect subjunctive does not fit into the synchronic tense system any longer. The AcI-construction is relevant because most of the sigmatic infinitives occur in AcIs with future reference. My findings here are completely new: it is telicity that governs tense usage in AcIs with future meaning.

## THE EXTRA-PARADIGMATIC TYPES IN ARCHAIC LATIN

For practical purposes, it is best to group the various forms into morphological categories and to look at them separately. This is done in Part II of this book (Chs. 6–10). Fortunately, we do not have to start from zero in the discussion: it is clear that a form like *attigam* is a first person singular active subjunctive of *attigere* ‘to touch’. What we cannot know at this stage is what tense and aspect this subjunctive has.

Perhaps the most conspicuous types are *faxō* (future, from *facere* ‘to do’), *faxim* (subjunctive), and *impetrāssere* (infinitive, from *impetrāre* ‘to obtain through prayer’). They are called ‘sigmatic forms’ because they share the morpheme *-s-* (after consonant) or *-ss-* (after vowel). The following types are attested:

1. indicative: *faxō*, *faxīs*, *faxīt*, *faxīmus*, *faxītis*, *faxīnt*;
2. subjunctive: *faxim*,<sup>3</sup> *faxīs*, *faxit*, *faxīmus*, *faxītis*, *faxīnt*;<sup>4</sup>
3. infinitive: *impetrāssere*.

<sup>3</sup> The *-ī-* was originally long here and in the 3rd pers. Before *-m*, long vowels were shortened prehistorically (Meiser 1998: 77). Before *-t*, the shortening is still in progress around 200 BC.

<sup>4</sup> Here the *-ī-* was shortened prehistorically by Osthoff’s law.

Like the sigmatic forms, the next group has the subjunctive morph *-ī-*, but no formant *-s-*:

subjunctive: *duīm, duīs, duit, duīmus, duītis, duint*.

It is not the *-ī-* that makes these forms irregular since we also find it in the present subjunctives *sim, sīs* (from *ēsse* 'to be'), *edim, edīs* (from *ēsse* 'to eat'), and in all perfect subjunctives like *amāuerim, amāuerīs* (from *amāre* 'to love'). The remarkable feature is that *duīm* and *duīs* (from *dare* 'to give') combine *-ī-* with a stem that is neither a present nor a perfect stem. This type is subject to two restrictions: only *dare* and some of its compounds have such forms, and there are no infinitives and merely a few indicatives like *interduō* beside the subjunctives.

Just as the preceding type, the last group is by and large confined to the subjunctive. But here we find the subjunctive morph *-ā-*:

subjunctive: *attigam, attigās, attigāt, attigāmus, attigātis, attigant*.

Again, the forms are not irregular because of the *ā*-morph as such. These 'extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctives' are special because they combine a non-present stem with *-ā-*, which is otherwise restricted to the present stem of all conjugations save the first.

We can ask the same four questions for all these types:

1. How productive are the formations?
2. Are there any peculiarities in their distribution over the various clause types?
3. Do they belong to any special registers?
4. What are their temporal and aspectual meanings?

Questions 1, 3, and 4 have never been examined systematically and question 2 has never been asked for all the extra-paradigmatic types. Consequently most of my findings here are new. The majority of extra-paradigmatic types are on their way out in Archaic Latin, but a few are still in regular use. The sigmatic indicatives have interesting patterns of distribution, with a clear split between main and subordinate clauses. The extra-paradigmatic subjunctives in general prefer main clauses over subordinate ones and are especially frequent in prohibitions. Those forms in particular that are no longer used regularly belong to the higher registers. The temporal and aspectual meanings

of extra-paradigmatic forms may at first sight seem to be highly diverse, but they fall into certain patterns that can be described with the same temporal and aspectual terms needed for the regular forms.

## **Productivity and Distribution Patterns**

How can we find solutions to these problems? Questions 1 and 2 require comparisons between the extra-paradigmatic forms and the regular ones. While it may be enough to contrast frequencies for question 1, question 2 demands that the regular and the irregular forms should be analysed syntactically. The standard concordances are insufficient for present purposes, for example Lodge (1924, 1933) for Plautus or McGlynn (1963, 1967) for Terence.<sup>5</sup> The reason is that their syntactic analyses are often not detailed enough and that the alphabetical order sometimes separates what has to be grouped together for the analyses. Consequently I have compiled my own data collections. These data are presented in appendices on my website ([wolfgang.demelo.de](http://wolfgang.demelo.de)). The book can of course be read and understood without looking at the appendices at all, but I hope that they may serve to document the conclusions of this book. The reader can find in them all the forms relevant to this work.<sup>6</sup> Forms outside Plautus and Terence are always cited in their syntactic contexts. Thus if readers want to see the complete sentences, they merely need these appendices and editions of Plautus and Terence.<sup>7</sup>

## **Register**

The third question above is more difficult to answer. How can we determine the register of certain forms?<sup>8</sup> There are no simple ways of finding out, but we can use at least three criteria.

<sup>5</sup> Jenkins's index (1932) is not always as reliable as McGlynn, but sometimes more practical for counting forms.

<sup>6</sup> Some forms are of course ambiguous. Consequently, I also set out in the appendices all the criteria by which I distinguish between e.g. future perfects and perfect subjunctives.

<sup>7</sup> Unless otherwise stated, I used Lindsay (1904, 1905) for Plautus and Kauer and Lindsay (1926) for Terence.

<sup>8</sup> Enkvist (1964) is helpful mainly for modern languages and literature. Landfester (1997) is also of limited use for a description of Archaic Latin. Hofmann and Ricottilli

The various characters in comedy can, on the whole, be grouped into a few types. One such classification can actually be found in one of Terence's prologues:<sup>9</sup>

(1) Quod sī persōnīs isdem huīc ūtī nōn licēt,  
quī mage licēt currentem seruom scribere,  
bonās mātrōnās facere, meretrīcēs malās,  
parasitum edācem, glōriōsum militem? (*Eun.* 35–8.)

But if he is not allowed to use the same characters, how can he any more be allowed to come up with a running slave, or to bring on good matrons and bad prostitutes, a voracious hanger-on, or a boastful soldier?

This list is far from complete. Apart from the slave (*seruos*), the hanger-on (*parasītus*), and the soldier (*mīles*), we also find the love-sick young man (*adulēscēns*), the pimp (*lēnō*), the Epicurean-style old man (*senex lepidus*), his strict counterpart (*senex dūrus*), and the ridiculous old man in love (*senex amāns*); among the female parts, we not only find good and bad matrons (*mātrōnae*) and prostitutes (*meretrīcēs*), but also servant-girls (*ancillae*) and women of marriageable age (*uirginēs*).

These different characters all speak differently. In recent years, much attention has for example been paid to the distinction between male and female speech in comedy.<sup>10</sup> Adams (1984) showed that women use exclamations and modifiers of commands that differ from their male equivalents; to give an example, *au* 'oh no' and *amābō* 'please' are typical of women, whereas *ei* 'oh no' and *quaesō* 'please' are used by men. Moreover, Schauwecker (2002) demonstrated that female speech in comedy is not uniform either. Thus the good matrons use hardly any imperatives at all, while the bad ones employ them frequently.<sup>11</sup> Similar considerations apply to all types of characters.

Not only do different characters speak differently in comedy, but there are also certain styles of speaking. A complete typology of these

(1985) contains several interesting observations, but the best discussion of Plautine style is still in Haffter (1934).

<sup>9</sup> A similar list can be found in *Haut.* 37–9.

<sup>10</sup> See Gilleland (1980) for passages from ancient authors concerning this difference in everyday speech.

<sup>11</sup> See Stockert (2004) for some corrections of Schauwecker's views.

different genres has not yet been compiled. However, some of the more conspicuous types marked by a higher, sometimes very formal register can be listed here:

1. tragic style, as in *Pseud.* 702–6;<sup>12</sup>
2. speeches of running slaves, as in *Curc.* 280–98;
3. military reports, as in *Amph.* 203–47 and 250–61; compare Ex. 2:

(2) Tum prō sē quisque id quod quisque potest et ualēt  
ēdit, ferrō ferīt, tēla frangunt, boāt  
caelum fremitū uirum, ex spīritu atque anhēlitū  
nebula cōnstāt, cadunt uolneris uī et uīrium. (*Amph.* 231–4.)

Then everyone carries out for himself what he can do and is able to; he smashes with his sword, the missiles break, the heavens resound with the uproar of men, from the breathing and gasping a cloud forms, they fall under the might of their wounds and our strength.

Note for example the frequent alliteration and the words *boāre* ‘resound’ and *anhēlitus* ‘gasping’, which are more common in tragedy and epic;

4. prayers, as in *Poen.* 950–3 or *Stich.* 402–5;
5. legal style, as in Ergasilus’ speech in *Capt.* 791–822,<sup>13</sup> or in *Mil.* 160–5.<sup>14</sup>

Finally, there is an interesting technique established by Happ (1967), who claims that style and metre interact. In antiquity, *dēuerbia/dīuerbia* (‘spoken passages’) were distinguished from *cantica* (‘musical passages’):

(3) Dēuerbia histriōnēs prōnūntiābant, cantica uērō temperābantur modis nōn ā poētā sed ā peritō artis mūsicae factis. (*Don. de com.* 8. 9.)

The actors spoke the *dēuerbia*, but the *cantica* were modified by tunes composed not by the poet, but by an expert in music.

<sup>12</sup> In l. 707, Charinus comments on this passage *ut paratragedāt*, ‘how he is using tragic style’.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. *ēdicō* ‘I announce as an edict’ in l. 803, *basilicās ēdictiōnēs atque imperiōsās* in l. 811, and *ēdictiōnēs aediliciās* in l. 823.

<sup>14</sup> Note that this speech is introduced by *ēdicō* in l. 159.

The terms *dēuerbium* and *canticum* recur elsewhere in Donatus, but without explanation (Don. *Ter. Andr. pr.* 1. 7, *Phorm. pr.* 1. 7, *Hec. pr.* 1. 7). According to Ps. Mar. Victorin. *gramm.* vi. 2. 2, the *dēuerbia* consist of trimeters, that is *senarii*, while the *cantica* consist of other metres.<sup>15</sup>

There is some evidence for the distinction between *dēuerbia* and *cantica* from the plays themselves:

(4) Tenē, tībīcen, prīmum; postideā locī  
 si hoc ēdūxeris, proinde ut cōsuētus's antehāc, celeriter  
 lepidam et suāuem cantiōnem aliquam occupitō cinaedicam,  
 ubi perprūriscāmus ūsque ex unguiculīs. Inde hūc aquam. (*Stich.* 758–61.)

Piper, take this first; then, if you have drunk it, just as you used to before, quickly play us some nice and sweet lewd tune where we itch all over down to our fingertips. Put in some water here.

This passage is in a *canticum* in trochaic septenarii; it is accompanied by the musician. After the last verse, however, the musician drinks, so he cannot play; as there can be no sung passage without musical accompaniment, the metre changes to *senarii*, the typical metre of *dēuerbia*. The *dēuerbium* ends as follows:

(5) Age, iam inflā buccās, nunciam aliquid suāuiter.  
 Redd' cantiōnem ueterī prō uīnō nouam. (*Stich.* 767–8.)

Go on, now puff out your cheeks, play something sweet now. Give us a new tune for the old wine.

This is the signal for the musician to play again. With the music, the final sung passage begins. It is in iambic septenarii and octonarii and in *uersus Reiziani*.

In the manuscripts, the *senarii* are often marked *DV* (*dēuerbium*), while the other types of verse are marked *C* (*canticum*).

Modern accounts of metre in comedy<sup>16</sup> normally make a threefold distinction that can already be found in Volkmann, Hammer, and Gleditsch (1901: 260–1); they differentiate between *senarii*, that is, *dēuerbia*, and two types of *cantica*. It is assumed that those *cantica* in trochaic septenarii and in iambic septenarii and octonarii were

<sup>15</sup> Rufin. *gramm.* vi. 2. 2 repeats this passage almost *verbatim*.

<sup>16</sup> See also Questa (1967: 268–9). For line divisions of *cantica* in manuscripts see Lindsay (1922: 263–5).

accompanied by music, but recited rather than sung, while the *cantica* in lyric metres were accompanied by music and sung. The former are normally referred to as 'long verses', while the latter are called *mūtātis modis cantica* ('songs in changing measures'), a term going back to Don. *de com.* 8. 9.

Haffter (1934) demonstrated that Terence's language is relatively uniform,<sup>17</sup> whereas Plautus has more elements of the elevated style in the two types of *cantica* than in the *senarii*. In *cantica*, that is all verses apart from *senarii*, high-register elements can occur without any particular reason, while in *senarii* they are normally restricted to marked passages such as prayers. Consequently we expect colloquialisms to be more frequent in the *senarii*, and high-register forms to predominate in the *cantica*.

There are twice as many lines in the *cantica* as in the *senarii*, but the lines of the *cantica* are often longer than those of the *senarii*. For this reason, Happ assumes that the ratio of *cantica* to *senarii* is 3 : 1. If so, stylistically unmarked forms should be distributed accordingly, colloquialisms should be more frequent in *senarii*, and high-register forms should be more frequent in *cantica*.<sup>18</sup>

Haffter's and Happ's metrical criterion works well for some elements of the higher style such as etymological figures. However, for morphological archaisms I have seldom found any distributional peculiarities. This of course does not mean that such archaisms are stylistically neutral, but it does mean that one cannot simply calculate the register of a form by looking at its distributional patterns. In those chapters in which I discuss register, I have consistently given information about the distribution of forms over verse types, not because that can settle questions of register easily, but because the metrical criterion has been given such prominence in recent discussions that I felt I should provide these data. In my own discussions of register I concentrate on the tokens in *senarii* because high-register forms are said to occur in the *cantica* without any obvious reasons; if a form is used both in *senarii* and in *cantica*, but within the *senarii*

<sup>17</sup> See also Bagordo (forthcoming).

<sup>18</sup> Dressler (1973) examined the register of forms undergoing iambic shortening by counting how many occur in *cantica* and how many in *senarii*. Wallace (1982) did the same for forms losing final -s. It appears that both phenomena are more frequent in colloquial registers.

predominates in passages such as prayers or military reports, it is likely that it belongs to a higher register.

The three factors character type, style of speech, and metre interact with each other in various ways. Thus only slaves are likely to give the speeches typical of the *seruos currēns*, and certain characters are more likely to speak than to sing; as Gratwick (1982: 111) put it, 'unsympathetic characters like the tutor Lydus in *Bacchides* live in the worlds of *senarii* and *septenarii*.' Moreover, various genres are restricted to certain metres; letters for example are normally in *senarii*.

### Tense and Aspect

Our last problem concerns the tense and aspect of the irregular forms. The native grammatical tradition begins at a time when such forms were known to educated people only from literature, but not from everyday conversations. If we want to find out what *faxō* means, we cannot rely on ancient grammarians, especially since they often fail to describe adequately the meaning even of those forms that were current when they were writing. We have to take a fresh look at the Archaic Latin texts. Three tests may help to establish the tense and aspect for example of *faxō*: what temporal adverbials is it combined with? What regular verb forms is it co-ordinated with? And what regular forms could substitute for it?

As the last two of these tests show, the extra-paradigmatic forms can only be discussed if the relevant regular forms are properly understood. While Part I (Chs. 2–5) is concerned with them, Part II (Chs. 6–10) is intended to provide a synchronic analysis of all the extra-paradigmatic types and to answer the above questions about them. It will also show how well the irregular forms, though not belonging to the usual paradigms, are integrated into the verbal system of Archaic Latin.

Ch. 6, which discusses the sigmatic future, crucially depends on the results of Ch. 2, in which I deal with simple future and future perfect. Chs. 7, 9, and 10, in which I shall be looking at the sigmatic subjunctives and the *ī*- and *ā*-forms respectively, builds on the results of Chs. 3 and 4, in which I examine the subjunctival sequence of tenses and prohibitions in the subjunctive. And Ch. 8, which is about

the sigmatic infinitives, is based on the results of Ch. 5, where I deal with the infinitives in the *accūsātīuus cum īnfīnītīuō* construction.

## THE DIACHRONIC SIDE

In Part III (Chs. 11 and 12) I shall turn to some diachronic problems, namely the origins of the forms and what happens to them after the archaic period. The synchronic analyses may help with both questions. We have to know what the forms mean and how they function if we want to find out how they fitted not only into the system of Archaic Latin, but also into that of pre-Latin and Proto-Italic.<sup>19</sup> My contribution to reconstruction will mainly be negative: I shall not produce any new theories, but merely review existing ones and select those that are viable. My synchronic results exclude some of the analyses which were advanced in the past. Ch. 12 is the first study that outlines how the extra-paradigmatic forms die out. It is intended to show what patterns there are in the loss of the archaic forms.

Part IV gives the reader a brief summary of my findings. Here I try to put together the various *membra disiecta*.

## DATA AND METHODOLOGY

Before I can start discussing the forms themselves and their uses, I should briefly deal with the remaining technicalities.

### Texts and Translations

Especially in Part I, but also in Part II, the bulk of my data comes from Plautus and Terence. This choice of texts is not haphazard. The

<sup>19</sup> There is still disagreement on how the similarities between Latin, Oscan, and Umbrian should be accounted for. I think Meiser (1993: 170–1) is right in saying that they are most easily explained by assuming a common proto-language, Proto-Italic. The family tree model and the wave theory do not contradict, but supplement each other, see Rix (1994a: 28).

only other Archaic Latin author of whose work a substantial amount has survived is Cato, but he has hardly any extra-paradigmatic forms; it is unclear whether this is because he is more progressive than is often stated, or because the forms, not being protected by metre, were edited out in antiquity. Writers like Ennius made more extensive use of them, but the number of fragments is too small to give us a proper corpus, and often the context cannot be established. Besides, such fragments may not be representative of an author at all. Many were preserved in the grammarians, who cite them because of their grammatical peculiarities. If all we had from Plautus were the fragments of the works outside the Varronian canon, and if we tried to reconstruct Plautine language on the basis of these, we should get a completely wrong picture and end up with an over-archaic collection of oddities.

Different editions use different spelling conventions. I have standardized the Latin spelling in my examples, except that of course I have not changed the spellings found in inscriptions. I do not distinguish between *-u-* and *-v-*, but write *-u-*, whether it is syllabic or not. I consistently put in final *-s* even where it was not pronounced. I also write *assum* and the like instead of *adsum* etc. *Poen.* 279 shows that the assimilation of *-d-s-* to *-ss-* had already taken place. Agorastocles misinterprets Milphio's *assum* 'I am here' as *assum* 'roasted', which would be difficult if Milphio had said *adsum*.

I mark all long vowels in Latin as long.<sup>20</sup> On the whole, this makes it unnecessary to mark short vowels as short. Occasionally, I have nevertheless done so, for example in rare names, or in order to indicate unambiguously that *uēnit* 'he is coming' is a present. Apart from that, there are two reasons why I have from time to time indicated in verse that vowels are short. Both have to do with *sandhi*-phenomena. First, let us look at *Cas.* 271, *atquē hoc crēdo impetrāssere*. Here I write *atquē* to show that the final vowel is not elided. Second, compare *Pacuu. trag.* 236: here *egō* and *istam* stand next to each other and scan as an anapaest because *-ō* is elided and *is-* counts as light by iambic shortening.<sup>21</sup> In verse, I write this sequence as *ego īstam*, that is, I do

<sup>20</sup> The exceptions are the references, which are cited according to the norms of the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, and Latin written by modern scholars such as Madvig. Quantities in languages other than Latin have not been marked consistently.

<sup>21</sup> For different explanations of iambic shortening see Devine and Stephens (1980; a fast-speech phenomenon) and Rix (1989; a poetic licence dating from the time when

not indicate that *egō* would have *-ō* when spoken in isolation, but I do show that *is-* counts as light. In prose, on the other hand, I indicate neither elision nor any other phonological features that have to do with the words occurring in phrases rather than as single items.

Note that a number of quantitative changes took place between Archaic and Classical Latin. To give an example, archaic *amābāt* ‘he loved’ became classical *amābāt*. In Ennius, we find both endings (*pōnēbāt* in *ann.* 371, *mandēbāt* in *ann.* 138). It is often claimed that this shortening has not yet started in Plautus, but if we do not scan *sīt* with a shortened vowel in *Mil.* 332, we have to argue for the very awkward iambing shortening in *hīs*. I have used the old quantities for the early texts and the classical quantities for the texts after 100 BC.<sup>22</sup> In discussions, I employ the classical quantities unless I am specifically making a point about Archaic Latin.

I did not regard it as necessary to give the reader morpheme-by-morpheme glosses. Instead, I have chosen to keep the translations of the passages relatively literal, especially when it comes to tenses. Literary translations may sound nicer than literal ones, but the benefits of having translations that are structurally close to the Latin seemed to outweigh the disadvantages by far.

## Data Collection and Textual Problems

My data collection is largely based on my own reading, but I have also benefited from the *BTL*, Neue and Wagener (1897), Lodge (1924, 1933), and other concordances.

I have tried to keep the discussion of textual problems to a minimum.<sup>23</sup> Since I did not look at the various manuscripts myself, I have merely indicated the presence of textual problems where they could be seen in the *apparātūs criticī* of the editions; it would be unwise to rest any argument on forms whose authenticity is not beyond doubt.

Latin had a strong initial accent). Coleman (1999: 36–7) takes an intermediate stance: he thinks that iambic shortening is partly an element of ordinary speech and partly a poetic licence. Drexler (1969) takes various factors into account (word class, word frequency, metre). He is well reviewed by Soubiran (1971).

<sup>22</sup> Consistency is only difficult to maintain where a late author is quoting an early one.

<sup>23</sup> Lindsay (1896) can serve as a first introduction to textual problems in Plautus.

I have marked textual problems by using asterisks, but have restricted this practice to the appendices on the internet.

### Statistical Analyses

Everybody working with a corpus of an ancient language will inevitably have the same problem that I experienced: there are hundreds of examples of things that are irrelevant for the purposes at hand, but sometimes there are only one or two examples of the interesting forms or constructions. This raises several questions: is the absence of certain forms or constructions due to chance, or is it systematic? And are special distributional patterns fortuitous? I have checked the significance of my data with a statistical test, the so-called t-test. It shows how likely it is that one can generalize from a sample of a certain size to an infinite population. The results are given in footnotes, and the test and the calculations can be found in appendix 13 on my website.<sup>24</sup>

After these technicalities, I can now discuss the archaic verbal system and the function the extra-paradigmatic forms fulfil in it. If, at the end of this book, readers have the feeling that they have gained a better understanding of these problems, or at least think that they have not wasted too much of their time, then I think I have done better than Seneca's grammar teacher.

<sup>24</sup> More on statistics can be found in Woods, Fletcher, and Hughes (1986) or Évrard and Mellet (1998).

*This page intentionally left blank*

## Part I

# Four Problems in the Latin Verb System

*This page intentionally left blank*

## Introduction to Part I

Occidit miserōs crambē repetīta magistrōs. (Iuu. 7. 154.)

Served up again and again, cabbage kills the wretched teachers.

ANYONE wishing to add to the plethora of scholarly publications on tense and aspect in Latin ought to think of a justification for doing so. Mine is twofold: first, I do not consider the problems to be discussed here as ends in themselves; I shall deal with them in order to examine how the extra-paradigmatic forms fit into the verbal system semantically. And second, while the usage of Classical Latin has been examined in detail, this is not the case for my specific questions concerning Archaic Latin. With regard to Classical Latin, scholars may not yet be able to explain everything, but we can say with some confidence that there are good descriptions. Yet in Archaic Latin we are not even close to having adequate descriptions. Consequently we must go back to the texts. For present purposes it is sufficient to look at some types of contexts in which the extra-paradigmatic forms can occur and to find out what functions the regular forms fulfil in them. This will enable us to draw a comparison between them and the extra-paradigmatic forms.

Most of the extra-paradigmatic indicative forms are sigmatic, for example *faxō* (from *facere* ‘to do’) or *capsō* (from *capere* ‘to capture’). The sigmatic indicatives are only employed in contexts where they must have future reference and alternate with other future forms. The irregular subjunctives, such as *faxīs* (again from *facere*), *duīs* (from *dare* ‘to give’), or *attigās* (from *attingere* ‘to touch’), are frequently found in prohibitions and in subordinate clause types which in Classical Latin follow the rules for the sequence of tenses.

The few infinitive forms are also sigmatic, for instance *impetrāssere* (from *impetrāre* 'to obtain through prayer'). They typically occur in *accūsātīuus cum īnfīnītīuō* constructions with future reference.

In Chs. 2–5, I shall examine four problems of the regular verb forms that will be relevant for the extra-paradigmatic ones:

1. What is the semantic difference between the simple future and the future perfect? Is it aspectual, temporal, or both? A discussion of this problem (Ch. 2) is important because we have to understand the meaning and use of regular future forms in order to see whether sigmatic futures like *faxō* or *capsō* (Ch. 6) behave in similar ways, and if so, whether they are closer to simple futures or future perfects.
2. Are there rules for the sequence of tenses in Archaic Latin, and if so, what are they? Again, the discussion will not be an end in itself; rather, I shall be looking for sequence rules in Ch. 3 because they can determine what meaning extra-paradigmatic subjunctives (Chs. 7, 9, and 10) have in the relevant contexts.
3. What types of prohibitions containing regular subjunctives are there in Archaic Latin, and are there distinctions between them? This question (Ch. 4) also matters for the extra-paradigmatic subjunctives in Chs. 7, 9, and 10. Once we know what patterns there are among prohibitions containing regular subjunctives, we can see to what extent the extra-paradigmatic forms behave like regular ones and to what extent they differ.
4. What morphologically standard infinitives are used in *accūsātīuus cum īnfīnītīuō* constructions with future reference? In this construction we also find sigmatic infinitives like *impetrāssere*, and it is impossible to discuss the meaning of the sigmatic infinitives (Ch. 8) without knowing what regular forms can be used and under what circumstances (Ch. 5).

For questions 1 and 2 three comedies furnish sufficient data. For this purpose Plautus' *Aululāria* and *Curculiō* and Terence's *Adelphoe* have been chosen. In questions 3 and 4, on the other hand, I am dealing with less frequent constructions. Consequently I shall have to look at the whole of Plautus and Terence.

## Simple Future and Future Perfect in Archaic Latin

THE main object of this study are the extra-paradigmatic verb forms of Archaic Latin. Among them, the sigmatic futures like *faxō* or *capsō* occupy a central place. They will be discussed in detail in Ch. 6. However, such forms cannot be understood in isolation. It is highly likely that speakers of Archaic Latin set them in relation to other forms and that their meaning is partly determined by the similarities they share with these other forms and by the differences which set them apart from them. As is well known, the distinction between the *infectum* and the *perfectum* stems is central to the Latin verb. Yet unlike the ‘regular’ future tenses of Latin, the type *faxō* cannot be assigned to either of them. In order to find out whether the difference between *faxō* and other futures is purely morphological or also semantic, we have to know the meaning of the standard formations and to contrast *faxō* and *capsō* with regular future forms. However, in the literature there is not even agreement on the meaning of the regular future tenses in Archaic Latin. Consequently the analysis of *faxō* and *capsō* has to be postponed for the moment until I have examined the regular future tenses. This is the purpose of the present chapter.

Simple futures, for example *dīcam* ‘I shall say’ and *parcam* ‘I shall spare’, belong to the *infectum* stem, while the corresponding future perfects *dīxerō* ‘I shall have said’ and *pepercerō* ‘I shall have spared’ are formed from the *perfectum* stem. There is a remarkable symmetry between the tenses of these two stems: in the indicative active, for instance, each of the main tenses (present and perfect) is accompanied by a past and a future, as can be seen from Table 2.1.

TABLE 2.1. The tenses of the *infectum* and *perfectum* stems

| <i>Infectum</i> ( <i>dīc-</i> )                               | <i>Perfectum</i> ( <i>dīc-s-</i> )                 |
|---|--|
| <i>dīcēbam</i> 'I was saying' (imperfect)                     | <i>dīxeram</i> 'I had said' (pluperfect)           |
| <i>dīcō</i> 'I am saying' (present)                           | <i>dīxī</i> 'I have said' (perfect)                |
| <i>dīcam</i> 'I shall say/shall be saying'<br>(simple future) | <i>dīxerō</i> 'I shall have said' (future perfect) |

The same kind of symmetry can be observed in the indicative passive and also in the subjunctive, both active and passive, even though the latter mood only has a twofold tense distinction.<sup>1</sup>

This pattern, whereby every form of the *infectum* is matched by one of the *perfectum*, is not inherited from Indo-European. Since such far-reaching innovations can hardly be haphazard, one might wonder whether the morphological parallelism had a functional correlate. One can then ask two closely connected questions:

1. Is there a semantic distinction between the futures of the *infectum* and the *perfectum*, and if so, what is it?
2. Are there semantic traits that unite all the *infectum* forms on the one hand and all the *perfectum* forms on the other?

I am mainly interested in the first of these problems. If I knew for certain that the answer to the second question were in the affirmative, this could help me with the first. I could then draw on the contrast between present and perfect, and between imperfect and pluperfect, and use my results there in order to find out what the distinction between simple future and future perfect is. However, I cannot take it for granted that all *infectum* and all *perfectum* forms have shared semantic features.<sup>2</sup> Consequently the answer to (1) might bring me

<sup>1</sup> There are no future subjunctives proper. The present posterior subjunctive *dictūrus sim*, 'I should be going to say', is the morphological counterpart of *dictūrus sum*, not of *dīcam*.

<sup>2</sup> See also Dressler (1968: 113–14) and H–S 317, 320, and 323. Serbat (1980: 4) goes much further by claiming that there is no direct correlation between form and meaning in the Latin indicative tenses; the difference between the two stems should be regarded as purely morphological. Others do believe that there are semantic features common to all *infectum* and all *perfectum* forms, see Meillet (1948: 28–30) or Pinkster (1983).

closer to a solution to (2), but (2) cannot shed any light on (1) because it presupposes that (1) has been solved.

The ancient grammarians' accounts of future tenses cannot be considered here. A general introduction to their theories is given by Robins (1997: 58–78). Except for Varro, who correctly recognized the future perfect as the future of the *perfectum* stem (*ling.* 9. 100), they generally treated the future perfect as a subjunctive form, see Serbat (1978: 264–6). Mellet (1994: 167), following Thomas's doctrine (1938: 166–98), believes that the reason is general confusion between future perfect and perfect subjunctive. For a refutation of Thomas see Vallejo (1942) and the statement in *Consent. gramm.* v. 375. 7–10: *quaecumque sunt optātīuī uerba, eadem et coniūctīuī sunt, ut ait Palaemōn; at quae coniūctīuī, nōn eadem et optātīuī. Dicimus enim 'cum fēcerō', 'cum lēgerō'; nōn dicimus 'utinam fēcerō', 'utinam lēgerō'.* 'Any verbs that are in the optative are also in the subjunctive, as Palaemon says; but those that are in the subjunctive are not automatically in the optative. For we say "when I shall have done" and "when I shall have read", but we do not say "†oh that I shall have done" and "†oh that I shall have read".' So Consentius must have felt a difference between the future perfect (*coniūctīuus*) and the perfect subjunctive (both *coniūctīuus* and *optātīuus*). I think that the reason for describing the future perfect as a subjunctive is simply its rarity in independent main clauses.

Most modern scholars regard the distinction between the absolute tenses past, present, and future as central to the Latin verb. However, that is already where agreement ends. There is no consensus on what constitutes the semantic difference between *infectum* and *perfectum* in general—if indeed there is such a difference—or between the simple future and the future perfect in particular.<sup>3</sup> Some argue that the distinction between the two futures is aspectual. It is only natural to look for a difference of this kind because most tense systems are at least to a certain extent also aspectual. Given that we have already identified three absolute tenses in Latin, it is not unlikely that we are now dealing with two aspects. Again, the exact nature of these aspects

<sup>3</sup> For bibliography on tense and aspect see Comrie (1976, 1985) or Dahl (1987). For the diachronic side see Bybee, Pagliuca, and Perkins (1994) or Heine, Claudi, and Hünemeyer (1991). For Latin see Pinkster (1983) or Oldsjö (2001).

is disputed. A number of people say that the simple future has imperfective and the future perfect perfective aspect, while others prefer to speak of non-concluded and concluded aspect; imperfective and perfective roughly correspond to the English periphrastic forms with *-ing* and their simple counterparts, while concluded aspect indicates that an event is over. We also find scholars who believe that the Latin tense system can be described without reference to aspect. They claim that the stems express a contrast that has to do with relative time. In their view, the simple future is just an unmarked future or conveys simultaneity, whereas the future perfect is marked for anteriority. Intermediate positions are also possible: the contrast could be both aspectual and temporal at the same time. In that case, the question arises whether tense or aspect is primary. Moreover, especially if one takes such an intermediate position, it is possible to hold different opinions about Archaic and Late Latin. Several people think that in the course of time the Latin verbal system became more and more temporal and less and less aspectual. Consequently, Tronskij (1973: 359) states that each Latin verb form has to be analysed with regard to three parameters: first, its absolute temporal value, past, present, or future; second, the extent to which it has preserved its original aspectual features; and third, the degree to which it has acquired the new meaning of relative time.<sup>4</sup>

Given this amount of disagreement, I find it essential to base my own theories on the analysis of a corpus. Nevertheless, it seems sensible not to begin with such a corpus, but first to clarify my use of terminology and to consider in general terms some of the possibilities there are. I shall then look at Plaut. *Aul.*, Plaut. *Curc.*, and Ter. *Ad.* and see in what way the actual data can be analysed most easily.

#### POSSIBLE CONTRASTS BETWEEN SIMPLE FUTURE AND FUTURE PERFECT

The usage of the two 'regular' futures in Archaic Latin could in theory be accounted for in various ways; metre, tense, and aspect are perhaps

<sup>4</sup> Vallejo's stance is similar (1951: 238): *sī fēcerō* began to express anteriority because of anterior *sī faxō*; originally, *fēcerō* was just a perfective future.

the most important of them. Among these three factors, the influence of aspect is the most difficult to assess. If the distinction between two forms is mainly aspectual, there will be more cases in which an author can describe one and the same thing in two different ways than if it is mainly temporal.

For a number of scholars aspect plays a considerable role in the organization of the Archaic Latin verbal system.<sup>5</sup> Aspect, roughly speaking, concerns the way an action or a state is presented or envisaged; as has also been stated, it describes 'situation-internal time' (Comrie 1976: 5). Among the various possible aspectual distinctions, the one that is perhaps known best is that between imperfective and perfective. If we want to talk about an action as an ongoing event that is not complete, we use the imperfective; if we want to describe it as a single, complete whole, we take the perfective.

This concept of imperfectivity and perfectivity can be illustrated with English progressive and non-progressive examples.<sup>6</sup> The verb in the subordinate clause in Ex. 1 is imperfective:

(1) While Peter *was eating* bread and cheese, Richard helped himself to a glass of wine.

The action in the *while*-clause is situated in the past. The progressive form shows that it is ongoing.

The same event that we had in the subordinate clause in the previous example can also be presented perfectly:

(2) Peter *ate* bread and cheese.

Here the action is likewise situated in the past, but the non-progressive marks it as a single, complete whole.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Such theories are first and foremost associated with Delbrück (1897: 326–7) in Germany and Meillet (1948: 28–30) in France.

<sup>6</sup> Dik (1997: i. 223–4) distinguishes between imperfective and progressive. It seems that the progressive aspect is in fact a special case of imperfective which can be used in a subset of situations in which the imperfective would be employed, see Comrie (1976: 25). The imperfective (as opposed to the perfective) is normally the unmarked option, while the progressive tends to be more marked than the non-progressive. However, this does not invalidate my examples. See Klein (1994) for a theoretical discussion of aspect in English, and Leech (1976) for a descriptive approach.

<sup>7</sup> This concept of boundedness is a crucial component of the perfective aspect in Russian, see Dahl (1987: 75).

The treatment of the forms in H-S 322–4 is representative of many aspectual approaches to the Latin future, but some background concerning Indo-European may be necessary. The now traditional view, outlined for example in Hoffmann (1970: 27–32) or Rix (1986: 7–11), attributes to Indo-European a ‘present’, an ‘aorist’, and a ‘perfect’ without assuming that each verb necessarily had a full set of these so-called tenses. The contrast is aspectual, but there is interference with the *Aktionsart*—the event type expressed—and the lexical meaning of the verbal root. With the addition of personal endings, roots can form presents or aorists, depending on their meaning. Hence *\*H<sub>1</sub>es-* (‘be’, cf. Latin *es-t*, Greek *ἐσ-τι*, English *is*) gives us a root present because the verb meaning does not imply an endpoint of the action, while *\*b<sup>h</sup>uH<sub>x</sub>-* (‘become, generate’, cf. Latin *fu-ī*, Greek *ἐ-φύ-ν*) yields a root aorist because the meaning does imply such an endpoint. The meaning of an aoristic root can be modified by adding various suffixes to create a present and vice versa. The contrast between present, aorist, and perfect is normally assumed to be aspectual: ‘present’ and ‘perfect’ are typically imperfective, with the perfect having stative value, while the ‘aorist’ is perfective. However, there are also some temporal distinctions. In the indicative, primary endings are used for the non-past.<sup>8</sup> Secondary endings, sometimes in combination with the augment, are used for the past. *\*H<sub>1</sub>es-(s)i* ‘you are’ (cf. Greek *εἶ* and remade *ἐσ-σί*) is the present tense of the present stem, and *\*H<sub>1</sub>e-H<sub>1</sub>es-s* ‘you were’ (cf. Greek *ἦσ-θα* with an extended ending) is the corresponding past (the imperfect) from the same stem.

A form like *fēcerīs* ‘you will have done’ is said to be derived from the short-vowel subjunctive of the *s*-aorist. Thus the distinction between future perfect and simple future was originally that between perfective (= aoristic) and imperfective aspect. Consequently we could translate *fēcerō* as ‘I shall do’ and *faciam* as ‘I shall be doing’. However, H-S accept that this contrast cannot really account for the distribution of the two tenses in Plautus any more. Nevertheless, they claim that this aspectual distinction can from time to time still be

<sup>8</sup> Indo-European probably had no future tenses as such, but employed prospective subjunctives, see Strunk (1968: 301) or Meier-Brügger, Fritz, and Mayrhofer (2002: 257); note that Pedersen (1921: 9) posited an Indo-European future in *\*-syē/o-*, cf. Sanskrit *dā-syā-mi* and Lithuanian *dúo-siu* (both ‘I shall give’).

encountered in Cicero. This is only possible if we are dealing with idiomatic, fixed phrases.

Other scholars prefer to describe the Latin verb system in temporal terms, with reference to absolute and relative tenses, but not necessarily to aspect.<sup>9</sup> Some of them do not speak about aspect at all, while others actually combine tense and aspect.

Absolute tenses situate an event on the time axis with reference to the moment of speech. The distinction that is usually drawn is that between the absolute tenses past, present, and future. Moreover, we should also recognize non-past and cross-linguistically rarer non-future tenses. We could for instance say that the Latin present indicative (*dīcis* ‘you are saying’) in statements is a true present tense rather than a non-past form because it contrasts with the simple future (*dīcēs* ‘you will be saying’) and the future perfect (*dīxeris* ‘you will have said’), both of which always refer to future time.<sup>10</sup> On the other hand, the Latin ‘present’ subjunctive in wishes (*utinam dīcās* ‘would that you should say’) does not stand in opposition to a special future form. It refers to present as well as future time and therefore is a non-past tense.

Relative tenses locate events on the time axis with respect to a reference point. This reference point may be the moment of speech, but it can also be situated in the past or future. Possible relative tenses are anterior, simultaneous, posterior, non-anterior, and non-posterior.<sup>11</sup> The Latin pluperfect can serve as a more or less uncontroversial example of a relative tense: it is usually described as being anterior to a past reference point (see H–S 320). Thus it expresses both absolute tense, namely the past, and relative tense, that is to say anteriority.

<sup>9</sup> See Madvig (1887), who is well aware of the category ‘aspect’, even though the terminology of that time is of course different. Most of his views recur in Gaffiot (1933) or Mellet (1994). For a similar approach with diachronic elements see Pinkster (1990: 231).

<sup>10</sup> Serbat (1975: 368–90) regards the Latin present as an unmarked, omnitemporal or atemporal form. This seems unlikely to me. See Pinkster (1998), who shows that the present cannot always be used instead of future or past tenses. If it is, it conveys special nuances.

<sup>11</sup> A non-simultaneous relative tense, i.e. one which may be either anterior or posterior, is hard to imagine. Note that the Australian language Ngiyampaa has a word *kampirra*, which means ‘a day either side of the reference time’, that is, it can mean either ‘yesterday’ or ‘tomorrow’ (Donaldson 1994: 37).

TABLE 2.2. The absolute and relative tenses of the Latin active indicative

| Anterior ( <i>dīc-s-</i> )        | Simultaneous ( <i>dīc-</i> )               | Posterior ( <i>dictūrus</i> )                 |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| <i>dīxeram</i> ‘I had said’       | <i>dīcēbam</i> ‘I was saying’              | <i>dictūrus eram</i> ‘I was going to say’     |
| <i>dīxī</i> ‘I have said’         | <i>dīcō</i> ‘I am saying’                  | <i>dictūrus sum</i> ‘I am going to say’       |
| <i>dixerō</i> ‘I shall have said’ | <i>dīcam</i> ‘I shall say/shall be saying’ | <i>dictūrus erō</i> ‘I shall be going to say’ |

Note: The type *dictūrus erō* is relatively rare, but cf. *ablātūrus erō* in Sen. *benef.* 5. 21. 3.

Pinkster’s theory (1983) is a good example of the temporal analyses. He describes the Latin verb system in terms of absolute and relative tenses. The absolute tenses are past, present, and future, and the relative tenses are anterior, simultaneous, and posterior. Anteriority is expressed through the *perfectum* and simultaneity through the *infectum*. For posteriority, the periphrastic *-ūrus* forms are used. Thus each stem has a unique meaning kept throughout its tenses. In order to accommodate the periphrastic forms, Table 2.1 above could be modified in the way I have done it in Table 2.2.

From this it follows that a future perfect like *dīxerō* ‘I shall have said’ should denote future anteriority.<sup>12</sup>

Now the concept of anteriority seems to be taken in two different ways by different people. If an anterior tense merely situates an event at a moment before a reference point, but does not specify any aspectual features, it ought to be possible to use the tense for something which is anterior because it begins before the reference point, but which is still going on at the time marked by that point. This is the case for the English perfect, as can be seen from Ex. 3:

(3) *I have known* this for a long time.

Here the perfect denotes what Haverling (2002: 158) calls ‘anterior continuing’. In other words, I knew the facts in the past, before the time of speaking, and I still know them today.

Others, when using the term anteriority, mean that an event not only begins before a reference point, but also that it must be over

<sup>12</sup> Pinkster is cautious about the future perfect and says that sometimes there might still be a ‘perfective’ value attached to it, without notions of relative time (1990: 226–7).

before it. If we take this stance, we are actually joining the temporal concept of anteriority with the aspectual notion of completion or conclusion.

Since there is a certain conceptual overlap between anteriority, conclusion, and perfectivity, I shall present some English examples where not all these notions obtain at the same time.

Exx. 4 and 5 show the difference between anteriority and conclusion:

- (4) I *have* always *liked* reading books.
- (5) I *had read* the book by the time you rang me.

In Ex. 4, my liking begins in the past and is anterior to the present reference point, but it is not concluded at it, as the normal assumption is that I still like reading books. Ex. 4, like Ex. 3 above, is a case of 'anterior continuing'. In Ex. 5, reading is not only anterior to the past reference point 'by the time you rang me', but also concluded, that is, it is over before it. There are no examples that are concluded (over), but not anterior; conclusion entails anteriority, but not *vice versa*.

Exx. 6 and 7 contrast perfectivity and conclusion:

- (6) I *shall find* the book again.
- (7) I *shall have done* the shopping before you come back.

Ex. 6 must be perfective. As finding a book is a momentaneous event, it can only be described as a single whole.<sup>13</sup> Nevertheless, Ex. 6 is not concluded in the sense in which Ex. 5 is because it is not over. In Ex. 7, on the other hand, doing the shopping is concluded because it is over before the addressee comes back. Consequently it must be described as a complete whole and must therefore be perfective. Again, conclusion entails perfectivity, but not *vice versa*.

In Exx. 8 and 9 I try to demonstrate the difference between anteriority and perfectivity:

- (8) I *have been studying* Latin for years.
- (9) I *will help* you.

<sup>13</sup> Consequently imperfective *I shall be finding* will be interpreted as involving repetition, as in *On my way home I shall be finding coins*. For Vendlerian aspect and a classification of 'states of affairs', i.e. of predicates with their arguments, see Dik (1997: i. 105–17) and, specifically for Latin, Pinkster (1990: 214–17).

Ex. 8 is anterior to the moment of speaking, but still going on at that time, so it must be imperfective. In Ex. 9, on the other hand, there is no anteriority, but the act of helping is a single whole, so this should be perfective. The two concepts are independent of each other.

Returning to Latin, we could say that Vairel (1978*b*: 392), while using aspectual terminology, in effect combines the temporal concept of anteriority with the aspectual concept of conclusion. She argues that all *perfectum* forms have the semantic trait of conclusion in common and takes perfects like *dedi* 'I have given' as her starting-point. Some scholars claim that such a form has the value of a 'completed present' (*présent accompli*) rather than of a past tense in the strict sense of the word.<sup>14</sup> However, the perfect is rarely used as a resultative present, but mostly as a past tense, as is obvious from the fact that more often than not it takes the secondary sequence of tenses in Classical Latin. How can this contradiction be resolved? Vairel's answer is that the completion does not take place at the moment of speech, which the term 'completed present' might suggest, but before it. Thus the value of the perfect is a combination of the present tense, which establishes a reference point in the here and now, and of the semantics of the *perfectum* stem, which denotes completion (aspect) before the reference point (relative tense). The double value of the perfect can then be explained without recourse to its historical origins: as its reference point is present, it can sometimes take primary sequence,<sup>15</sup> and as it marks completion before the present, it can also take secondary sequence.

If Vairel is right and the *perfectum* stem conveys this double meaning through all its tenses, the pluperfect, the present perfect, and the future perfect should mark completion before a past, a present, and a future reference point, respectively.

In my next example, the perfect stands for an event that is anterior and 'completed' before the moment of speech:

<sup>14</sup> This is the result of saying that *infectum* and *perfectum* are not only morphologically parallel, but also semantically. In Table 2.1 we saw that the *infectum* and the *perfectum* have three tenses each. If *dicēbam* and *dixeram* are past, and if *dicam* and *dixerō* are future, then not only *dicō*, but also *dixi* must be presents.

<sup>15</sup> Primary sequence occurs if the results of the past main clause action are regarded as still relevant at the present reference point.

(10) (Aeneas tells of the sad fate of his city.)

*Fuimus* Trōes, *fuit* Īlium et ingēns  
glōria Teucrōrum. (Verg. *Aen.* 2. 325–6.)

We are no longer Trojans, and gone is Ilium and the outstanding glory of Teucer's descendants.

Aeneas says that he was a Trojan and that Troy existed, but that both these things are no longer true. His being Trojan and the existence of Troy are not only anterior to the moment of speech, they are also over, that is to say, 'completed'.

In Exx. 3 and 4 above, we saw that English uses the perfect for events beginning in the past and continuing into the present. Latin employs the present tense in such cases, as in Ex. 11, which corresponds to Ex. 3 above:

(11) (Philoxenus wants to confess something to Nicobulus, who gives a rude answer.)

*Philoxenus*: Nihilī sum. *Nicobulus*: Istuc iam prīdem scio. (*Bacch.* 1157.)

*Philoxenus*: I am a ne'er-do-well. *Nicobulus*: I have known (lit.: I know) that for a long time.

Here *iam prīdem* shows that *Nicobulus*' knowledge is not restricted to the present, but began in the past.<sup>16</sup> Since the Latin perfect is excluded from such contexts, Vairel seems to be right in saying that it always has an element of completion.

Similarly, there are several instances where we can see Vairel's *perfectum* value of both anteriority and completion in future perfects in Plautus:

(12) (Labrax is making an offer to Gripus and wants to underline that this is the last chance to accept.)

*Labrax*: Audi.

Si hercle *abiero* hinc, hīc nōn erō. Vīn centum et mille? *Gripus*: Dormīs.  
(*Rud.* 1327–8.)

*Labrax*: Listen. If I shall have gone away from here, I shan't be here. How about one thousand one hundred? *Gripus*: You must be dreaming.

<sup>16</sup> Other examples can be found in Haverling (2002: 158).

The conditional clause is not only anterior to the main clause, it is also concluded before it, otherwise the main clause could not be the consequence of the conditional clause. However, in order to verify Vairel's generalization that all *perfectum* forms are concluded, we have to check if the future perfect can be interpreted as 'future anterior continuing' in some contexts.

The theories discussed so far were all 'simple' in the sense that they advocated more or less invariable meanings for the simple future and the future perfect. Yet there are also scholars, for example Sjögren and Bennett, who argue that the contrast between the two tenses is more complex. Depending on the context, it is sometimes temporal, sometimes aspectual, and sometimes neutralized completely.<sup>17</sup>

Sjögren (1906: 133–95) believes that the original difference between simple future and future perfect has to do not only with aspect, but also the lexical meaning of the verbs involved. Durative verbs prefer the simple future, momentaneous ones the future perfect. In subordinate clauses, the durative simple future shows that the action is still ongoing at the time of the main clause event, while the momentaneous future perfect is used when this action is already past before the main clause event begins. This leads to the reinterpretation of the future perfect in subordinate clauses, where it often has future anterior meaning. In main clauses, there are instances of this meaning as well, but on the whole there is either an aspectual difference between simple future and future perfect, or none at all, in which case the usage is determined by metrical necessities.<sup>18</sup>

On the whole, Bennett (1910: 53–9) agrees with Sjögren, but is much more explicit. He thinks that in subordinate clauses the distinction between simple future and future perfect is one of relative time, and that the future perfect regularly denotes anteriority here as early as Plautus. However, he argues that in main clauses the future perfect does not normally have the special anterior value. With regard to the usage of future perfect and simple future in main clauses, Bennett (1910: 57) says:

<sup>17</sup> See Novakova (2000) for an interesting analysis of the French future perfect; she also takes tense, aspect, and modality into account.

<sup>18</sup> For similar views see Lindsay (1907: 60) or Reinhold (1956: 39–40).

But if there be a difference of force between the tenses in the forms just cited, no one has ever stated it. . . . In view of the not uncommon equivalence of different forms of expression in modern languages, it seems methodically superfluous to insist on a difference in the ancient languages under similar conditions. If the difference exists and is tangible, it should be recognized and stated; but we are under no necessity of attempting to distinguish differences that do not exist.

There are some points in Bennett's exposition that I cannot agree with. To begin with, his argument that in modern or ancient languages two forms belonging to different morphological categories could frequently be used without any semantic difference does not persuade me. True synonymy is rare both at the lexical and at the morphosyntactic level.<sup>19</sup> The fact that for example the English *going to* and *shall/will* futures can often be employed in the same contexts does not mean that they are equivalent. There is a great amount of overlap between the respective usages, but there are also enough cases in which the meaning differences are obvious. The *going to* tense is essentially a present prospective, while the *shall/will* tense is a genuine future. Fleischman (1982: 86–90) points out that the same distinction holds between the French *aller* prospective and the synthetic future. One of her examples (1982: 87) is from Maupassant: *il avait l'apparence d'un homme qui va mourir* ('he looked like a man who *is about to die*'). She remarks that the simple future would be pointless here because everybody will die sooner or later, while the present prospective gives the phrase a nuance of imminence. The same is true of English.

If the Latin verb system was originally aspectual and ended up being temporal, a gradual, but semantically direct change seems more plausible than an indirect one which had an intermediate stage without temporal or aspectual contrasts, whether in pre-Latin or in Latin itself. It seems to me that the two tenses are not interchangeable in

<sup>19</sup> Two forms belonging to the same category normally have the same semantics, e.g. *audiam* 'I shall hear' and *audibō* 'I shall hear'. But there may still be differences of register and productivity. If two forms belong to different categories, synonymy will be even rarer, though it does exist, cf. Greek *πέποιθα* and *πέπεισμαι* (both 'I trust'). There was no semantic need for a medio-passive form in the perfect because the intransitive active itself already had the value of the new form; *πέπεισμαι* was merely created to fill up the paradigm.

most main clauses, let alone in all contexts. Yet this would be the consequence of complete synonymy. Thus the statements to this effect would be unhelpful if it came to writing Archaic Latin. If they were correct—and they do not seem to be so—we could choose between the two futures simply on the basis of metrical necessities. I think that the influence of metre is often overestimated. Latin word order is free enough to give a writer a choice between two verb forms, which are then put into appropriate slots in the line. I do not believe that metrical considerations would allow a speaker to employ a form that would be ungrammatical in the context in which it is used. All that is possible is that in places in which grammar and meaning permit either form, the actual decision between them is taken on metrical grounds.

The fact that the two future tenses cannot always substitute for each other is confirmed by Gaffiot (1933) and Risselada (2000). Gaffiot believes that the two tenses are always semantically distinct, in Cicero as well as in Plautus (1933: 164–5). The future perfect marks the completion of the action and the resulting state. There are many contexts in which either tense would be grammatical and would make sense; under these circumstances, the choice becomes stylistic. He acknowledges (1933: 170–1) that metre plays a part in the selection of tenses, but only in passages in which the speaker has a choice anyway. Risselada bases her study on one single comedy by Plautus, the *Menaechmī*, but examines the tenses in it in more detail. She gives us the figures for both the simple futures and the future perfects in main and subordinate clauses; these are reproduced in Table 2.3.

They show that in main clauses the simple future is more than sixteen times as frequent as the future perfect, while in subordinate clauses it occurs only twice as often. This pattern makes it clear that

TABLE 2.3. Simple futures and future perfects in main and subordinate clauses

|                      | Simple futures | Future perfects | Total | Future perfects (%) |
|----------------------|----------------|-----------------|-------|---------------------|
| Main clauses         | 149            | 9               | 158   | 5.70                |
| Subordinate clauses  | 38             | 19              | 57    | 33.33               |
| All clauses together | 187            | 28              | 215   | 13.02               |

Note: These figures are based on Risselada's study, but were modified: I have excluded *faxō* 'I shall bring it about' and other sigmatic futures, tenses governed by *faxō*, and idiomatic *amābō* 'please'.

the two tenses are not just random variants whose distribution is determined by metre. If that were true, the ratio of future perfects to simple futures ought to be the same in main and subordinate clauses. And even if the contrast between the two futures were only neutralized in main clauses, as Bennett would have it, we should still expect a different distribution: there ought to be fewer simple futures and more future perfects in main clauses than there are now. Risselada explains the distribution in temporal terms: the simple future is an absolute future tense and hence the normal tense in main clauses, even though not infrequent in subordinate ones. The future perfect, on the other hand, is a future anterior. As anteriority is a relative concept—a form is normally anterior to something else—the future perfect must needs be rare in main clauses and figure more prominently in subordinate ones. What Risselada does not discuss is whether this temporal analysis is sufficient or has to be supplemented with the aspectual concepts ‘concluded’ and ‘non-concluded’. If the future perfect can stand for anterior, but continuing events, it cannot be marked for concluded aspect. On the other hand, if it is used exclusively for events that are over in the future, it is likely to have the feature ‘concluded’.

In this section, I have defined perfectivity, anteriority, and conclusion. Given the variety of opinions, it is not possible to argue on first principles which of these—if any—constitute the distinction between simple future and future perfect. Nevertheless, I hope at least to have shown that metre can hardly be the decisive factor for tense choice. In the next section I shall be looking at the future tenses in three plays.

## THE REGULAR FUTURE FORMS IN THREE PLAYS

Since I am by and large restricting myself to a corpus of three comedies in this section, Plaut. *Aul.* and *Curc.* and Ter. *Ad.*, it is easy to compile statistics and compare the distribution of simple futures and future perfects in main and subordinate clauses. I shall leave out the sigmatic futures, futures governed by *faxō* ‘I shall bring it about’, and idiomatic *amābō* ‘please’. In this way I arrive at a picture very similar to what could be seen in Table 2.3, where I presented Risselada’s data

TABLE 2.4. The distribution of future tenses in *Aul.* and *Curc.*

|                      | Simple futures | Future perfects | Total | Future perfects (%) |
|----------------------|----------------|-----------------|-------|---------------------|
| Main clauses         | 185            | 5               | 190   | 2.63                |
| Subordinate clauses  | 17             | 24              | 41    | 58.54               |
| All clauses together | 202            | 29              | 231   | 12.55               |

*Note:* One of the future perfects in main clauses is the form *meminerō* 'I shall remember'. Since this verb has no *infectum* stem, the *perfectum* does duty for it.

for *Men.* The distribution of simple futures and future perfects over main and subordinate clauses in *Aul.* and *Curc.* can be gleaned from Table 2.4.

The future perfect is, on the whole, much rarer than the simple future.<sup>20</sup> The latter is almost seven times as frequent as the future perfect in Plautus. Probably this in itself cannot tell us anything about what the difference between simple future and future perfect consists in. Low frequency is one of the criteria for markedness,<sup>21</sup> so the future perfect should be more marked than the simple future.<sup>22</sup> If the future perfect is a future anterior, it is more marked than a simple, neutral future because it has an additional semantic feature. This could explain the smaller number of tokens. Yet it has also been argued that the perfective aspect is more marked than the imperfective.<sup>23</sup>

What is remarkable is the extremely low frequency of the future perfect in main clauses in the two Plautine comedies. It occurs in only 2.63% of all the main clause futures. In other words, the simple future is more than thirty-seven times as frequent. Risselada's figure for *Men.* is 5.70%, which is still a very low percentage.

In subordinate clauses, the ratio is much more even. The future perfect is found in almost three-fifths of Plautine subordinate clauses with future tenses, while in Risselada's study the simple future

<sup>20</sup> As a t-test shows, the likelihood that this finding is statistically significant is higher than 99.95%.

<sup>21</sup> Dik (1997: i. 41) defines markedness as follows: 'A construction type is more marked to the extent that it is less expectable, and therefore commands more attention when it occurs.'

<sup>22</sup> Croft (1990: 71–2) has a useful list of factors that can make forms more or less marked.

<sup>23</sup> See Croft (1990: 93), who is, however, more cautious elsewhere (1990: 264, n. 19). Dahl (1987: 69 + 72) states that perfective and imperfective do not have very clear marking relations.

TABLE 2.5. The distribution of future tenses in *Ad*.

|                      | Simple futures | Future perfects | Total | Future perfects (%) |
|----------------------|----------------|-----------------|-------|---------------------|
| Main clauses         | 133            | 9               | 142   | 6.34                |
| Subordinate clauses  | 16             | 14              | 30    | 46.67               |
| All clauses together | 149            | 23              | 172   | 13.37               |

dominates here as well, occurring in two-thirds of the subordinate clauses in the future. On the whole, however, the number of main clauses with future tenses is much higher than that of the respective subordinate clauses, so the difference between Risselada's and my own results should not be overestimated.

In main clauses, Terence has more future perfects than Plautus (Table 2.5).<sup>24</sup> By contrast, the number of simple futures exceeds that of future perfects in subordinate clauses in Terence, while it is the other way round in Plautus. However, the absolute numbers are not very high, so the differences, which are not great to start with, ought not to be exaggerated. At any rate, they cannot be used to argue for diachronic change between the two authors: if the future perfect started as a perfective form and became a relative tense, it should become less frequent in main clauses. If anything, my limited data indicate the opposite.

Where does all this leave us? The future perfect is extraordinarily rare in main clauses, but not in subordinate ones. This fact can hardly be explained through perfectivity, but is not surprising if the future perfect is a relative tense of anteriority or has concluded aspect. In order to find out, I shall first look at the usage of the simple future and the future perfect in subordinate clauses because the instances there are relatively uncontroversial. Even scholars like Bennett, who thinks that the difference in main clauses is either aspectual or non-existent, believe in a temporal distinction in subordinate clauses. I can then examine the two tenses in main clauses. Here special emphasis must be given to the future perfect in main clauses because it is often claimed to be different from the future perfect in Classical

<sup>24</sup> The likelihood that the differences in distribution between simple future and future perfect are statistically significant is higher than 99.95%, as can be seen from a t-test.

Latin, and to be semantically indistinguishable from the simple future.

The simple future in subordinate clauses can refer to events which take place at the same time as the main clause event (Ex. 13), or which are actually anterior to it in the real world (Ex. 14):

- (13) (A cook is being sent to the neighbours' house.)

Siquid ūtī *uolēs*,  
domo aps te affertō. (*Aul.* 340–1.)

If you *shall want* to use anything, take it from your place.

- (14) (A banker reads out a letter addressed to him.)

Tēcum ōro et quaesō, qui hās tabellās *afferēt*  
tibi, ut *ēi*<sup>25</sup> dētur quam istīc ēmī uirginem. (*Curc.* 432–3.)

I kindly ask you that the girl I bought in Epidaurus should be given to the person who *shall bring* these tablets.

In Ex. 13, the wish to employ a utensil arises in the cook before he takes it, and it continues until some time after that. The timespan of wanting includes that of taking. Linguistically, this is expressed by using the simple future in the subordinate clause, which could be interpreted as imperfective, non-concluded, and simultaneous with the main clause.<sup>26</sup> In Ex. 14, on the other hand, the bringing of the tablets is past before the girl can be handed over. This could be rendered iconically by using the future perfect in the relative clause. Here, however, the speaker has chosen not to make the anteriority explicit and to take the simple future. Such independent time reference is the more frequent the weaker the connection between main and subordinate clause is. In conditional clauses, for example, it is rarer than in relative clauses. To some extent, the speaker has free choice here. While *uolēs* in Ex. 13 could be regarded as imperfective, *afferēt* in Ex. 14 is more likely to be perfective; the translation 'who shall be in the process of bringing' seems less convincing.

In our three comedies, future perfects are only used in subordinate clauses if the event is over before the main clause action begins. The

<sup>25</sup> For the scansion *ēi* see Lindsay (1922: 168–9) and Questa (1967: 109–10).

<sup>26</sup> In English, the verb *want* can have the progressive form only under special conditions; here it cannot be used.

event in the subordinate clause is described as a complete whole (perfectivity), but it is also concluded and anterior:

(15) (A slave promises to bring wine when his master is back.)

At iam afferētur, si ā foro ip̄sus *redierit*. (Aul. 356.)

But it shall be brought immediately if my master *shall have returned* from the market.

Here the return of the master is anterior to the slave's act of bringing the wine, and it must also be over before it; the interpretation 'anterior continuing' is impossible.

To summarize, because of cases like Ex. 13 (simple future, imperfective) and Ex. 14 (simple future, perfective), it seems that the distinction between perfective and imperfective cannot account for the distribution of future perfects and simple futures in subordinate clauses. It is more plausible that the future perfect is anterior and concluded, as in Ex. 15, while the simple future is simultaneous or non-anterior and also non-concluded.

I shall now turn to the simple future in main clauses. There are instances where it can be interpreted imperfectively:

(16) (Euclio wants to carry his pot of gold with him, for fear that it might be stolen otherwise.)

Hoc quidem hercle, quōquō ībō, mēcum *erit*, mēcum *feram*. (Aul. 449.)

Wherever I shall go, this, by Hercules, *shall be*<sup>27</sup> with me, I *shall be carrying* it with me.

Here an imperfective or progressive translation makes good sense. The speaker does not seem to present the act of carrying the pot around as a single, complete, and indivisible whole, but rather as a protracted process or a collection of events, as it were. Yet most instances of this tense in main clauses are more likely to be perfective:

(17) (Euclio wants to take revenge on Lyconides' slave.)

Ībo intro atque illi sociennō tuō iam *interstringam* gulam. (Aul. 659.)

I'll go in there, and that accomplice of yours—I'll *strangle* him on the spot. (transl. Nixon 1916: i. 303.)

<sup>27</sup> The verb *to be* allows progressive forms only under special circumstances. Contrasts like *he is polite* (permanent characteristic) versus *he is being polite* (temporary behaviour) are comparatively rare.

In this example, Euclio utters a threat. Normally we threaten to do things completely, from beginning to end, and the imperfective is usually not appropriate for this kind of speech act, while the perfective is.<sup>28</sup> Note that the English imperfective translations 'I shall be going' and 'I shall be strangling' do not make sense.

I shall now look at the future perfect in main clauses. The three plays taken together contain only fourteen tokens. One of them (in *Curc.* 492) can hardly be taken into account because the verb involved is *meminisse*, which does not have a present stem. Consequently the future perfect must take the place of the simple future. We are left with thirteen forms, three in *Aul.*, one in *Curc.*, and nine in *Ad.*

There are some instances where future perfects stand for inbuilt consequences, in other words, where the future perfect in the main clause describes an automatic result of the subordinate clause:<sup>29</sup>

(18) (Micio thinks that his brother is unfair and should listen to his arguments.)

Haec sī uolēs  
in animō uerē cōgitāre, Dēmea,  
et mi et<sup>30</sup> tibi et illīs dēmpseris molestiam. (*Ad.* 817–19.)

If you shall want to consider this properly, Demea, you *will have spared* me, yourself, and them a great deal of nuisance.

The conditional clause contains a simple future. If Demea is prepared to be fair, he will as a result have freed himself, Micio, and their sons from unnecessary quarrels. The main clause does not introduce a new action that will take place after the event in the subordinate clause has been brought about. Rather, the main clause stands for what unavoidably happens at the same time as the event in the subordinate clause comes true.

<sup>28</sup> Imperfective threats are rare. An example would be Dido's *sequar ātrīs ignibus apsēns et, cum mors animā sēdūxerit artūs, omnibus umbra locīs aderō* (Verg. *Aen.* 4. 384–6), 'though absent, I shall follow you with dark flames, and when cold death has separated body and soul, I shall be present as a shadow at all places.'

<sup>29</sup> Risselada (2000) calls this use 'retrospectively evaluative'.

<sup>30</sup> Kauer and Lindsay print *mihi et*, which presumably ought to be scanned *mih(i) ēt*. However, complete synaloephe is more likely than Kauer and Lindsay's iambic shortening, see Quasta (1967: 101).

*Tuo officiō fueris fūctus* in *Ad.* 603 is used to describe an inbuilt result as well.<sup>31</sup> It is co-ordinated with *animum... releuābis* in l. 602, which does not have to be analysed as resultative. I regard both phrases, *officiō fungī* and *animum releuāre*, as having an endpoint, so there is no difference in *Aktionsart* that could account for the difference in tense. I take *fēceris* in *Curc.* 665 as another instance of an inbuilt result, namely of the promise 'I shall give the dowry' (*ego dōtem dabō*, *Curc.* 663). This interpretation gets some confirmation from the fact that all the other ten Plautine instances of *fēceris* as main clause future perfects have that meaning.<sup>32</sup>

Even though this meaning can account for many of the future perfects in main clauses and is important for the correct interpretation of the passages involved, it is hardly ever recognized in commentaries. A few examples should suffice: Ashmore (1908: 304) gives *Ad.* 843 a future perfect translation, and Sloman (1886: 112) remarks that the future perfect is resultative; but both of them wrongly take the same type of future perfect in *Ad.* 819 as denoting speed and certainty of the action. Collart (1962: 118) is not even sure whether *fēceris* in *Curc.* 665 is a future perfect or a perfect subjunctive.

The use of the future perfect for inbuilt consequences has also been recognized for Ciceronian Latin by Lebreton (1901: 200–3). The main clause future perfect can be combined with a conditional, temporal, or relative clause, or with an imperative; under these circumstances, the future perfect is said to mark the equivalence of the main and the subordinate clause.

The term 'equivalence' is, it seems, not ideal. True equivalence is expressed by using the same tense in the subordinate and the main clause:

<sup>31</sup> Blase (1898: 321) remarks that there is no semantic difference between the passive future perfect formed with the simple future of the copula and that formed with the future perfect of the copula. In Plautus and Terence, however, the latter type is rare and restricted to (semi-)deponents; apart from the token above, it can be found in *Epid.* 123, *Men.* 472, *Poen.* 1280, *Andr.* 213, *Phorm.* 516. (*Āmōta... fuerit* in *Epid.* 282, a genuine passive, is based on a conjecture.)

<sup>32</sup> *Men.* 661 and *Poen.* 1218 are very similar because in both of them one speaker makes a promise, while another describes its consequences. *Men.* 272 and *Merc.* 139 have results following imperatives, and *Capt.* 296, 695, 968, *Mil.* 1243, *Pseud.* 512, and *Trin.* 279 stand after conditional clauses. *Pseud.* 654 contains a prohibitive perfect subjunctive, not a future perfect, *pace* Lodge (1933: 581).

(19) (Euclio is suspicious of Megadorus' generosity and does not believe that it is genuinely altruistic.)

*Megadorus*: Dabitur, adiuuābere ā mē. Dīc, sī quid opust, imperā.

*Euclio*: Nunc *petit*, quom *pollicētur*. (*Aul.* 193–4.)

*Megadorus*: You will be given money, you will be helped by me. Just tell me if you need anything, I'm at your command. *Euclio*: Now he *is making demands* by *making promises*.

Here 'making demands' (*petere*) and 'making promises' (*pollicērī*) are equated in the so-called 'cum identicum'-construction. The tense is the present in both clauses. It can also be the simple future:

(20) (Cicero has promised to support Torquatus.)

Quae cum *faciam*, beneuolentiam tuam ergā mē *imitābor*, merita nōn *assequar*. (*Cic. fam.* 6. 4. 5.)

By *doing* this I *will imitate* your kindness towards me, but not *achieve* your merits.

'Doing' (*facere*) and 'imitating' (*imitārī*) are presented as one and the same action. This is expressed iconically by using the same tense.

The main clause future perfect for inbuilt consequences is often very close in meaning to the constructions in Exx. 19 and 20. It is frequently combined with a conditional clause which is in the future perfect as well. This identity of tenses could remind us of the *cum identicum*, but it does not always exist. Any clause type can precede, and any future expression is possible, be it a future perfect, a simple future, or an imperative. Moreover, the consequence can even be stated by a different speaker, which is impossible for *cum identicum*:

(21) (Demea's son loves a courtesan. Demea will take both to the country. Micio thinks that this is a good idea.)

*Demea*: Et istam psaltriam

ūna illūc mēcum hinc *apstraham*. *Micio*: *Pugnāueris*;

eō pāctō prōrsum illi alligāris filium. (*Ad.* 842–4.)

*Demea*: And as for that music-girl, I *will pull* her from this place to the other with me. *Micio*: You *will* (thereby) *have fought* a big battle.<sup>33</sup> In that way you *will have tied* your son to that place completely.

<sup>33</sup> See McGlynn (1967: 60) for the meaning of *pugnāre* here. Before him, Donatus had already glossed the future perfect as *magnam rem fēceris*.

Here Micio tells Demea what the result of his future action will be; this statement is not made by Demea himself, but by Micio. I have added ‘thereby’ in my translation to stress the resultative nuance.

The usage of the future perfect for inbuilt consequences is idiomatic.<sup>34</sup> It is not immediately obvious why it should be the future perfect rather than the simple future that is used in such contexts. Perhaps the simple future is excluded because it would refer to absolute future time, to something taking place after the other event. To be more concrete, a simple future *pugnābis* in Ex. 21 would yield an interpretation such as ‘I shall pull her away.—You *will* (subsequently) *win* the day.’ By contrast, the future perfect can express inbuilt results because it does not refer to something happening after the subordinate clause. This meaning is perhaps easier to derive from a future anterior, maybe with concluded aspect, than from a perfective future without anteriority. The latter would presumably, like the simple future, refer to something that occurs after the action in the conditional clause.

My next example is also resultative, but describes a state:

(22) (A pimp is afraid that it will be too late for litigation when he comes back from abroad.)

Nunc si hoc omittō—āctum agam ubi illinc redierō;  
nīl est; *refrīxerit* rēs. (*Ad.* 232–3.)

But if I leave it now—when I have returned from there, I shall be doing a thing that has been done with. There’s no point: the matter *will have gone cold*.

A translation such as ‘the matter will grow cold’ would be wrong; it will not grow cold, but be cold, that is, it will have become cold, and that process is over. Only the future anterior with concluded aspect allows for such a resultative interpretation.

In *Ad.*, there is an instance of *abierō*, ‘I’m off’:

<sup>34</sup> Note that the perfect subjunctive can be used in a similar way: *sī nunc mē suspendam, meam operam luserim et praeter operam restim sūpti fēcerim et meīs inimicīs uolūptātem creāuerim* (*Cas.* 424–6), ‘if I should hang myself now, I should (thereby) have wasted my effort, and apart from the effort I should have spent money on buying a rope, and I should have given joy to my enemies.’

TABLE 2.6. Simple futures and future perfects of *īre* and some of its compounds in main clauses

|         | <i>abīre</i> | <i>adīre</i> | <i>exīre</i> | <i>īre</i> | <i>prōdīre</i> | <i>redīre</i> | <i>trānsīre</i> | Total   |
|---------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|----------------|---------------|-----------------|---------|
| Plautus | 6 : 6        | 15 : 0       | 5 : 0        | 144 : 1    | 1 : 0          | 3 : 1         | 3 : 0           | 177 : 8 |
| Terence | 2 : 1        | 10 : 0       | 1 : 0        | 27 : 0     | —              | 1 : 0         | —               | 41 : 1  |
| Total   | 8 : 7        | 25 : 0       | 6 : 0        | 171 : 1    | 1 : 0          | 4 : 1         | 3 : 0           | 218 : 9 |

Note: Metaphors are excluded.

(23) (Micio is annoyed at Demea's interference in his son's education.)

*Demea*: Tūn cōsulis quicquam? *Micio*: Āh, sī pergis, *abierō*. (*Ad.* 127.)

*Demea*: You give him advice, do you? *Micio*: Oh, if you are going on about it, I am off.

A perfective, non-anterior translation 'I shall go away' seems to make as much sense as an anterior, concluded one, 'I shall have gone away', 'I'm off'.<sup>35</sup> Which of the two alternatives is correct? In order to settle this question, one has to look not only at *abīre*, but also its base verb *īre* and its compounds. Two restrictions can be made: first, I am of course only interested in those verbs that have finite future forms in main clauses, and second, I shall examine only those uses which are not metaphorical, and which denote physical movement. These criteria make many compounds of *īre* irrelevant: *ambīre*, *anteīre*, *circumīre*, *coīre*, *dēperīre*, *disperīre*, *inīre* (*grātiām*), *interīre*, *nequīre*,<sup>36</sup> *obīre*, *perīre*, *praeterīre*, *quīre* in both Plautus and Terence, *antidīre*, *praeīre*, *subīre* in Plautus, and *introīre*, *prōdīre*, *trānsīre* in Terence. In Plautus, I count *introīre* as two words, compare *ībis intrō* in *Pseud.* 654. This leaves us with *abīre*, *adīre*, *exīre*, *īre*, and *redīre* for both Plautus and Terence, and with *prōdīre* and *trānsīre* for Plautus.<sup>37</sup>

Table 2.6 displays the ratios between simple futures and future perfects in main clauses for these verbs in Plautus and Terence. The picture emerging is quite remarkable. The most frequent verb is *īre*. It has 171 simple futures in Plautus and Terence together,

<sup>35</sup> *Abierit* 'he'll be off' in *Aul.* 656 has a very similar context, but is in a different person. Stockert (1983: 216) says that this might be a true future anterior.

<sup>36</sup> If indeed this and *quīre* are compounds of *īre*.

<sup>37</sup> On the so-called *Meyersches Kriterium*, on the whole accepted by H-S 302–3, see Grassi (1973), who rejects it convincingly.

yet there is only one single future perfect.<sup>38</sup> Future tenses of *redīre* are relatively rare in main clauses, but there is one future perfect alongside the four simple futures.<sup>39</sup> Four verbs, *adīre*, *exīre*, *prōdīre*, and *trānsīre*, have no future perfects at all. Admittedly, *prōdīre* and *trānsīre* are rare, and *exīre* is not particularly frequent either; but the 25 simple futures of *adīre* in Plautus and Terence are not matched by a single future perfect. For *abīre*, on the other hand, which is the semantic opposite of *adīre*, there are eight simple futures and seven future perfects in Plautus and Terence.<sup>40</sup>

The obvious contrast, then, is between *īre* and *adīre* on the one hand and *abīre* on the other. The difference in tense usage might at first sight be regarded as the result of different *Aktionsarten*: both *abīre* and *adīre* are telic, while *īre* on its own is atelic; in other words, *abīre* and *adīre* contain natural endpoints, while *īre* does not. If I interrupt someone who is going away or going to someone, the person has not yet gone away or gone to someone; but if I interrupt someone who is walking, the person has already walked. However, on closer inspection there is no real contrast in *Aktionsarten* because *īre*, which on its own is atelic, mostly becomes telic because it is combined with *domum* or similar expressions, which convey endpoints.<sup>41</sup> Metre can hardly be responsible for using the future perfect of *abīre*, but not of *adīre*: the tenses of the two verbs scan in exactly the same way. Likewise, the extra-linguistic events referred to are similar in most cases: they take place in the future, sometimes after another future event as in Ex. 23. However, if we look at *adīre* and *abīre* more closely, we can notice a difference in tone. The future of *adīre* is normally used by someone speaking to himself:<sup>42</sup>

<sup>38</sup> *Capt.* 194. The future perfect seems to have been chosen primarily for metrical reasons, but the translation 'I shall have gone there', 'I shall be there' does make sense.

<sup>39</sup> *Pseud.* 647, where it could be translated as 'I'll be back'.

<sup>40</sup> *Accēdere* and *apscēdere* behave in the same way in Plautus. In main clauses, the former has 13 simple futures and 2 future perfects, while the latter has 3 simple futures and 7 future perfects. For tense usage in asides see Pinkster (1985a: 187–8).

<sup>41</sup> I have counted how often future forms of *īre* have expressions that make them telic. Frequently such expressions must be understood from the context, but as these cases are less certain, I have not taken them into account. The one future perfect in Plautus is modified by *ad frārem*. 82 of the 144 simple futures in Plautus and 18 of the 27 in Terence have such telicizing adverbials.

<sup>42</sup> There are only three exceptions: *Capt.* 616, *Mil.* 1242, and *Hec.* 429.

(24) (A cook sees the guests coming.)

*Adibo* atque alloquār. (*Men.* 277.)

I *shall go to* them and address them.

In instances like this, the speaker simply announces a plan or a decision, without further ado. The simple future of *abīre* can also be used for such plain statements:

(25) (Syrus has organized a splendid meal, but no one is coming.)

Nam iam *abibo* atque ūnum quicquid, quod quidem erit bellissimum, carpam. (*Ad.* 590–1.)

For now I *shall go away* and pick for myself the best parts of it.

Here Syrus is merely saying that he is going away. The simple futures in Exx. 24 and 25 are most naturally interpreted as perfective. If the future perfects can also be interpreted in this way, the contrast with the simple future cannot be one of perfective and imperfective. Now the future perfect of *abīre* is perfective and always implies speed, for instance because the speaker is annoyed and cannot stand the addressee any longer, as in Ex. 23 above, or because there is a threat and the speaker is afraid:

(26) (Periphanes is angry with a music-girl.)

*Periphanes*: Properā sis fugere hinc sī tē dī amant. *Girl*: *Abierō*. (*Epid.* 515.)

*Periphanes*: Get out of here, will you, if the gods love you. *Girl*: I *am off*.

The girl obviously wants to say that she is rushing off as quickly as possible. *Abierō* must be perfective. As Ex. 25 shows, there can be no opposition to imperfective *abībō*. The meaning of quick execution can easily be derived from a future anterior with concluded aspect: ‘I shall be gone’ equals ‘I am off’. Unlike Madvig (1887: 472), however, I do not think that the concept of speed is inherent in the future perfect;<sup>43</sup> it is the constellation of a concluded future anterior tense and a context in which the speaker is in haste that leads to this interpretation.

<sup>43</sup> For a refutation of this hypothesis of Madvig’s see Meifart (1885), who used an earlier edition of Madvig’s work. It must be said, though, that he takes his criticism too far.

In this connection one might also cite *Merc.* 776–7, where an old man wants to chase off a cook. As the cook has not been paid, he tries to annoy the old man by being particularly slow, both mentally and physically. He uses *abībitur*, not *abierō*.

In my text sample, there are also three main clause future perfects of the verb *uidēre* ‘see’, all of them in *Ad.*:

(27) (Ctesipho fears that his father could see him. Syrus tells him to go inside and be calm.)

*Ctesipho*: Quidnamst? *Syrus*: Lupus in fābulā.

*Ctesipho*: Patēr est? *Syrus*: Ipsust. *Ctesipho*: Syre, quid agimus? *Syrus*: Fuge modo intro; ego *uīderō*. (*Ad.* 537–8.)

*Ctesipho*: What’s the matter? *Syrus*: Talk of the devil—*Ctesipho*: Is it my father? *Syrus*: Yes, in person. *Ctesipho*: Syrus, what are we doing now? *Syrus*: Just flee inside; I *shall see to/shall have seen to* it.

The other two instances are very similar: *Ad.* 845 also contains the form *uīderō*, while *Ad.* 437 has the third person singular *uīderit*.<sup>44</sup> The meaning is not ‘see something’, but ‘see to something’. Pfister (1936: 32–3) seems to be right in saying that this special meaning of the future perfect makes it impossible to contrast the form with its putatively imperfective counterpart *uidēbō* ‘I shall be seeing’. The two meanings ‘see something’ and ‘see to something, take care of something’ are easy enough to disambiguate. I have found the following distribution in Plautus and Terence: in subordinate clauses, only the meaning ‘see’ (or ‘seem’ in the one passive instance in *Haut.* 801) occurs, whether the simple future or the future perfect is used. Here the difference in tense can be interpreted as that between simultaneous (and non-concluded) and anterior (and concluded). In active main clauses, the simple future has the meaning ‘to see’,<sup>45</sup> while the future perfect has that of ‘to see to, to take care of, to sort out’.<sup>46</sup> In the

<sup>44</sup> Ashmore (1908: 281) thinks that this is a jussive perfect subjunctive; however, there are no good parallels. Because the construction type is the same as that of *uīderō*, I think Martin (1976: 171) is correct when he classifies the form as a future perfect. The jussive force, if indeed there is any, is just an implicature.

<sup>45</sup> The sense is usually that of physical perception, but in *Haut.* 558 it is mental.

<sup>46</sup> Simple future: *Amph.* 147, *Asin.* 606, *Curc.* 168, 212, *Trin.* 1104, *Eun.* 367, 1009, *Haut.* 558; future perfect: *Merc.* 448, 450, *Ad.* 437, 538, 845, *Andr.* 456, *Hec.* 700. I follow Bentley in reading *nē scīueris* ‘don’t know’ (perfect subjunctive) in *Mil.* 572 rather than Lindsay’s *nēscīueris* ‘you will not have known’ (future perfect with jussive

passive, only the simple future *uidēbitur* occurs; it has the meaning ‘it shall be seen to’ in *Asin.* 685 and *Persa* 311, but the meaning ‘it will seem’ in *Persa* 342. Why the future perfect should be avoided in the passive is unclear, but the distribution of the forms according to their semantics is so neat that synchronically it seems to be idiomatic. *Vīderō* ‘I shall see to it’ is also idiomatic in Cicero, not only in the first person singular, see Lebreton (1901: 200–3).<sup>47</sup> This makes Mellet’s slightly contorted reasoning (1994: 156) unnecessary: according to her, it is only the firm promise implicit in the future perfect *uīderō* that can avert further questioning by the interlocutor.

Two future perfects remain:

(28) (A slave wants to steal Euclio’s gold.)

Crēdo efferēt iam sēcum et mūtābit locum.

Attat, foris crepuit. Senēx eccum aurum effert forās.

Tantīsper hūc ego ād ianuam *concesserō*. (*Aul.* 664–6.)

He will now take it outside with him, I believe, and change the place. Hey, the door has creaked. Look, the old man is taking the gold outside. Meanwhile, I *shall have stepped aside* here to the door.

(29) (Euclio does not want to drink with Megadorus.)

*Megadorus*: Pōtāre ego hodiē, Eucliō, tēcum uolō.

*Euclio*: Nōn pōtem egō quidem herclē. *Megadorus*: At egō *iusserō* cadum ūnum uinī ueteris ā me afferrier. (*Aul.* 569–71.)

*Megadorus*: I want to drink with you today, Euclio. *Euclio*: But I, by Hercules, will not drink. *Megadorus*: But I *shall have ordered* a jar of old wine to be brought here from my place.

Both examples have been used to show the perfective value of the future perfect. But the simple future is employed under similar circumstances and would be possible here as well. Since it would also have to be regarded as perfective, we must become doubtful about this aspectual interpretation. The future perfect seems to be used to present the actions retrospectively. In Ex. 28, the slave tells us what Euclio will do (*efferēt* in l. 664). He would do none of his secret

force). Consequently I take *uideris* in the next line as a prohibitive perfect subjunctive (*uīderīs*) introduced by *nec*.

<sup>47</sup> Cicero rarely uses the simple future in the same meaning, e.g. *uidēbimus* in Cic. *Att.* 3. 10. 1.

activities if he spotted the slave, a potential thief. So the slave, having announced what Euclio will do, adds retrospectively that he will have stepped aside and will thus allow Euclio to take the gold somewhere else.<sup>48</sup> Similarly, *iusserō* 'I shall have ordered' is presented retrospectively in Ex. 29, from the future vantage-point of the festivities.<sup>49</sup>

Thus each of the two future tenses has the same meaning in main and subordinate clauses. The simple future stands for simultaneous and non-concluded events, while the future perfect is employed for anterior, concluded actions.

## CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter I have examined the contrast between simple future and future perfect. I introduced three aspectual and temporal concepts: perfectivity, anteriority, and conclusion. An event is perfective if it is described as one single, complete whole. I speak of anteriority if an action is situated before another one, without necessarily being finished before it. By contrast, conclusion means that one event is over before the next one begins. Conclusion entails both perfectivity and anteriority, but neither perfectivity nor anteriority entails any of the other concepts. Each of these notions has been argued by various scholars to distinguish the future perfect from the simple future, and the only firm conclusion that we can draw from their accounts is that there is no agreement on what constitutes the difference between the two tenses.

For this reason, I had to analyse some data myself. I examined the future tenses in a corpus consisting of three comedies: Plaut. *Aul.* and *Curc.* and Ter. *Ad.* I showed that the future perfect, unlike the simple future, is remarkably rare in main clauses, while the ratio is more even in subordinate clauses. This does not speak for a contrast of

<sup>48</sup> At least this future perfect could also be interpreted as resultative ('I shall be out of the way').

<sup>49</sup> A similar usage can found in Ovid, who begins some lines with *dixerat et* (cf. *dixerat... suumque rettulit ōs* in *Ou. met.* 2. 301–3) or with *dixit et* (cf. *dixit et... iussit* in *Ou. ars* 317–18). These expressions are convenient metrical variants. The former makes the anteriority of speaking explicit, the latter leaves it to the reader to infer it from the context.

perfective and imperfective between the two tenses, but could indicate a distinction of anterior versus simultaneous or of concluded versus non-concluded. When looking at the individual instances, I argued that the simple future is always simultaneous and non-concluded, but only sometimes imperfective. The future perfect is always perfective, but this feature is insufficient for describing for example its use for inbuilt consequences; in each case, it can in addition be analysed as anterior and also concluded—there are no instances of ‘anterior continuing’. Consequently it seems that the simple future is marked for simultaneity and non-conclusion, while the future perfect is marked for anteriority and conclusion. Perfectivity, on the other hand, is not a relevant feature. I also noted that the future perfect *uīderō* ‘I shall see to it’ does not express anteriority, but is an idiomatic exception in the tense system. In some contexts, either future perfect or simple future would be grammatical and would make sense. In such cases, the writer may be influenced by metre or stylistic differences arising from the slightly different senses.

I have not addressed the wider question whether all *īnfectum* and all *perfectum* forms have common respective semantic features, and if so, what they are. I am inclined to believe that all *īnfectum* forms are simultaneous and non-concluded, and that all *perfectum* forms are anterior and concluded. However, this could only be proved by more extensive analyses.

The discussions of this chapter will be relevant again when I turn to the sigmatic future in Ch. 6. There I shall discuss to what extent *faxō* and *capsō* can be compared to simple futures like *faciam* and *capiam* or to future perfects like *fēcerō* and *cēperō*. The sigmatic futures stand next to sigmatic subjunctives like *faxim* and *capsim*. In order to discuss these, I shall have to compare them with regular subjunctives. This can only be done successfully if I solve two problems connected with the regular subjunctives: to what extent are the sequence rules of Classical Latin valid for Archaic Latin, and what are the distinctions between the various subjunctives in prohibitions? I shall now turn to the first of these problems, the sequence rules of Archaic Latin.

## The Sequence of Tenses in Archaic Latin

THE majority of extra-paradigmatic forms are subjunctives. I shall discuss them in Chs. 7, 9, and 10. Many of these subjunctives occur in complement clauses introduced by *ut*, *nē*, and other subordinators. In several types of subordinate clauses speakers can select the tense independently of the surrounding text. But in others, mainly in complement clauses, the tense choice is conditioned by the semantics of the superordinate clause. In that case, we speak of ‘sequence of tenses’ or *cōnsecūtiō temporum*. The fact that the choice of tenses is not free in such subordinate clauses has great advantages for anyone investigating the semantics of extra-paradigmatic forms. The selection of an extra-paradigmatic subjunctive in such a context presupposes that the form shares at least some temporal and aspectual features with other forms which could occur here as well.

However, it is not clear whether the sequence rules of Archaic Latin are identical with those of Classical Latin. It follows that the meaning of extra-paradigmatic subjunctives in contexts where sequence of tenses is to be expected can only be examined properly after an investigation of the sequence rules in Archaic Latin in general. Since no such investigation existed when I began my work on extra-paradigmatic subjunctives, I had to conduct a study myself. Its results are set out in this chapter. They will be relevant again when I discuss the extra-paradigmatic subjunctives in subordinate clauses in Chs. 7, 9, and 10.

Sequence of tenses is well-known not only from Classical Latin, but also from other languages.<sup>1</sup> Exx. 1 and 2 provide English data:

<sup>1</sup> See Hornstein (1990) for a general introduction and English examples.

TABLE 3.1. The *cōsecūtiō temporum* of the Latin active subjunctive

|                                   | Subordinate clause =<br>anterior <i>dix-</i> | Subordinate clause =<br>simultaneous <i>dīc-</i> | Subordinate clause =<br>posterior <i>dictūrus</i>  |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Non-past superior-<br>dinate verb | Perfect <i>dixerim</i>                       | Present <i>dīcam</i>                             | Present periphrastic<br><i>dictūrus sim</i>        |
| Past superordinate<br>verb        | Pluperfect <i>dixissem</i>                   | Imperfect <i>dīcerem</i>                         | Imperfect<br>periphrastic<br><i>dictūrus essem</i> |

(1) I *can* see that he is busy.

(2) I *could* see that he *was* busy.

In Ex. 1, the main clause is in the present. The subordinate clause is simultaneous with it and consequently in the present as well.<sup>2</sup> In Ex. 2, the subordinate clause also refers to something simultaneous, but as the main clause is past, a past tense is employed in the subordinate clause too.

In Latin grammar, the term ‘sequence of tenses’ can be used in two ways: in a broader sense it refers to the tense usage of subordinate clauses both in the indicative and in the subjunctive, and in a narrower sense it is restricted to the latter. In this chapter, I shall limit myself to the subordinate clauses in the subjunctive.

A first overview of the usage in Classical Latin can be gleaned from Table 3.1. This is based on Table 2.2, which displays the indicative tenses. Concerning the expression of time, there are similarities and differences between indicative and subjunctive. Both moods have three relative tenses, anterior, simultaneous, and posterior. The main difference is that the indicative also has three absolute tenses, past, present, and future, while the subjunctive distinguishes merely between past and non-past. Consequently there is no special subjunctive of the future or the future perfect. (*Dictūrus sim* is the subjunctival counterpart of the present posterior indicative *dictūrus sum* rather than of the true future tense *dīcam*.)

<sup>2</sup> In what follows, I shall use the terms ‘anterior’, ‘simultaneous’, and ‘posterior’. I am thus adopting the terminology in K–St ii. However, I take ‘anterior’ as shorthand for ‘anterior and concluded’, and ‘simultaneous’, for ‘simultaneous and non-concluded’.

For practical examples of the sequence of tenses see also Exx. 3–6:<sup>3</sup>

(3) *Rogō tē, quid dīxerīs/dīcās/dictūrus sīs.*

*I am asking you what you have said/are saying/are going to say.*

(4) *Dō tibi aliquid, nē mē nēquīquam adiūuerīs/adiuuēs.*

*I am giving you something so that you should not have helped/should not be helping (should not be going to help) me in vain.*

(5) *Rogāuī tē, quid dīxissēs/dīcerēs/dictūrus essēs.*

*I asked you what you had said/were saying/were going to say.*

(6) *Dedī tibi aliquid, nē mē nēquīquam adiūuissēs/adiuuārēs.*

*I gave you something so that you had not helped/were not helping (were not going to help) me in vain.*

In Exx. 3 and 4, the main clause verbs are in the present tense, so they do not situate the events in the past. In that case, one of the tenses from the first row in Table 3.1 is chosen in the subordinate clauses. This is known as ‘primary sequence’. By contrast, the main clause verbs in Exx. 5 and 6 are in the perfect, and they do situate the respective events in the past. Under these circumstances, a tense from the second row in Table 3.1 has to be used in the subordinate clauses. This is the so-called ‘secondary sequence’. Borrowing a term from English grammar, we could also speak of ‘backshift of tenses’. It should be noted that the subordinate clauses in Exx. 3 and 5 are indirect questions, while those in Exx. 4 and 6 are final *nē*-clauses. Only in indirect questions and *quīn*-clauses is posteriority regularly expressed in Classical Latin, while in other subordinate clauses it is the simultaneous relative tense that does duty for both simultaneity and posteriority.

The sequence rules are relatively uncontroversial for Classical Latin and are set out very clearly in K–St ii. 174–97 or Menge, Burkard, and Schauer (2000: 636–54). The most fundamental ones are implied in examples Ex. 3 to Ex. 6, and a more detailed account is given below. What is far less certain is whether Archaic Latin also has such rules, and if so, what they are. According to Lindsay (1907: 56), for example, the fact that ‘the strict laws of Sequence should often be defied by the

<sup>3</sup> As it is difficult to find exact minimal pairs, I made up Exx. 3–6 myself. All other Latin examples in this chapter are taken from Plautus, Terence, Cicero, and Caesar.

colloquial Latin of Plautus is only natural'. Allardice (1929: 70), on the other hand, states that 'Terence for the most part conforms to the recognised laws of Sequence. Apparent irregularities can generally be explained by reference to influences such as *repraesentatio*, *constructio ad sensum*, the unrealised Imperf. Subj. referring to the Present, etc.' From these two accounts it appears that the classical rules are on the whole applicable to Plautus and Terence, but that there are some exceptions in Terence and many more in Plautus.<sup>4</sup>

What neither Lindsay nor Allardice attempts to do is collect the full evidence and give figures of how frequently the classical usage is not observed.<sup>5</sup> Such data, however, would be essential for answering the following three questions:

1. Is it possible to state the same rules or similar ones for Plautus and Terence?
2. If so, to what extent are they valid? Is there a rationale behind the exceptions? Or if the rules are not applicable, are there others?
3. Are there differences between Plautine and Terentian usage, and if there are any, how can they be explained?

In what follows, I shall analyse a representative text sample in order to extract rules. For this purpose, I have examined in detail the same three comedies as in Ch. 2, that is Plaut. *Aul.* and *Curc.* as well as Ter. *Ad.* These three plays provide us with 645 subjunctives in subordinate clauses.<sup>6</sup> This number should be large enough to give us reliable results. There are, however, some special rules for which the three comedies do not furnish enough data, for instance concerning the tense choice of an unreal subjunctive following a non-past superordinate verb. In such cases I have also taken examples from other plays.

In order to formulate a first hypothesis concerning the three questions, we can count purely mechanically the tenses of the subjunctive

<sup>4</sup> By contrast, Wackernagel (1926: 253) maintains that exceptions such as lack of backshift are very rare not only in Classical, but also in Archaic Latin.

<sup>5</sup> The relevant figures are not even provided in Wirtzfeld's dissertation (1888), even though it is about the sequence in Plautus and Terence.

<sup>6</sup> Included are the subjunctives dependent on forms of *cauēre* and on extra-paradigmatic verb forms such as *faxō* as well as those subjunctives in subordinate clauses that actually do not have main clause verbs beside them.

TABLE 3.2. Subjunctives in subordinate clauses in *Aul.*, *Curc.*, and *Ad.*

|                                    | Expected<br>sequence | Unexpected<br>sequence | Total           | Unexpected<br>sequence (%) |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|
| Non-past<br>superordinate<br>verbs | 498 (335 + 163)      | 4 (2 + 2)              | 502 (337 + 165) | 0.80 (0.59, 1.21)          |
| Past superordinate<br>verbs        | 85 (51 + 34)         | 31 (17 + 14)           | 116 (68 + 48)   | 26.72 (25, 29.17)          |
| Total                              | 583 (386 + 197)      | 35 (19 + 16)           | 618 (405 + 213) | 5.66 (4.69, 7.51)          |

Note: I have included all the verbs dependent on forms of *cauēre*, but not those dependent on extra-paradigmatic forms such as *faxō*, or those which do not actually have main clause verbs beside them, e.g. in the type *quid sī abeam?* This explains why there are only 618 subjunctives here in total, while I said before that there are 645 subjunctives in subordinate clauses in the three plays.

in subordinate clauses, completely ignoring semantic criteria for the moment. We might expect a main clause in the present, the future, the future perfect, or the imperative to combine exclusively with the subjunctives of the primary sequence, while all other main clauses should only have secondary sequence beside them. Table 3.2 shows that these expectations are not always fulfilled. Each box contains three figures. The first is the sum of Plautus and Terence, and in brackets I give the figures for Plautus and Terence separately.

Despite all its possible imperfections, this table can help us to formulate a first hypothesis with regard to the three questions:

If the superordinate verb is in a non-past tense, only primary sequence applies in the subordinate clause, as in Classical Latin. If it is in a past tense, backshift of tenses is optional, with secondary sequence occurring in about three-quarters of the cases, and primary sequence being attested in roughly one quarter of the examples. This lack of backshift is a crucial difference from Classical Latin. Within Archaic Latin itself, Plautus and Terence have the same usage.

This hypothesis may be proved or falsified in the course of the chapter. Even if it turns out to be correct, a more sophisticated analysis is required because the count in Table 3.2, on which I based it, might be flawed in several respects. On the one hand, the percentage of exceptions may actually be higher: some clauses could merely seem to follow the sequence rules, while in reality the tense of the subjunctive has been selected independently and fits into the pattern by pure

chance.<sup>7</sup> This is particularly obvious in the type *cauē fēcerīs*, which looks like a good example of primary sequence after a non-past verb, and which was consequently classified under ‘expected sequence’. However, while the perfect subjunctive would be the right tense to indicate anteriority after the imperative, the meaning militates against this interpretation: *cauē fēcerīs* means ‘take care you do not do x’. If such cases are not counted, the number of exceptions remains unchanged, while the total number of tokens decreases; as a result, the proportion of irregular sequence will be higher. On the other hand, it might be that there are fewer exceptions than expected: some of the clauses that seem to violate the sequence rules could simply be outside their scope, in which case they ought not to be regarded as examples of irregular sequence.

In order to refine the analysis and to make a truly accurate count of tokens that do or do not behave as in Classical Latin, one must consider not only the morphology, but also the semantics of the forms and the clauses they are in. Sequence of tenses is not a mechanical attraction of morphological features, but sensitive to the meaning.<sup>8</sup>

(7) (Cicero is trying to reassure Atticus.)

Sed nē *dubitārīs* quīn, quod honestius, id mihi *futūrum sit* antīquius. (Cic. Att. 7. 3. 2.)<sup>9</sup>

But *do not doubt* that I *will give preference* to the more honourable solution.

The main clause is in the perfect subjunctive. In many contexts, the perfect subjunctive refers to events that are past, and the tenses for secondary sequence from Table 3.1 are chosen in the subordinate clauses. Here, however, the perfect subjunctive is used prohibitively,

<sup>7</sup> Such cases are discussed in detail by Grassi (1966).

<sup>8</sup> For purely practical reasons, I shall nevertheless classify the instances according to their morphology rather than their semantics. This ensures that I shall not prejudge for example governing-clause perfects like *dixi* ‘I have said’, which can have either past or present meaning. Consequently a form like *nōuī* ‘I know’ counts as a perfect, not as a present. This is only problematic if such a form is in the superordinate clause and has primary rather than secondary sequence, but all arising difficulties will be dealt with in my discussion.

<sup>9</sup> All citations of Cicero in this chapter are from the Teubner editions, except for Exx. 17 and 36, which are from the Oxford texts.

without past meaning, so a non-past subjunctive is employed in the subordinate clause.

In the next two sections I shall improve my analysis by giving it a semantic basis. Since my initial hypothesis was that the difference between the sequence rules of Archaic and Classical Latin is merely that backshift of tenses is not yet compulsory in Archaic Latin, I must test this theory by presenting the classical rules in more detail and by comparing the archaic data with the classical usage. I shall do so in the following section, using mostly the three comedies, but having recourse to data from other plays as well where necessary. Here I shall also deal with the 'exceptions' in Lindsay (1907: 56–7) and see whether they are at random or conform to certain principles. In the second section I shall examine which subordinate clause types should for semantic reasons be outside the scope of the sequence rules in both Archaic Latin and the classical language, and which therefore have to be excluded from my final count, regardless of whether or not their tenses by chance conform to the tenses that would be predicted by the rules. These first two sections will enable me to provide revised statistics for the three plays; the statistics will show whether it makes sense to apply the classical rules to Archaic Latin, and if so, to what extent. Finally, I shall summarize my results, which will modify my initial hypothesis and answer the three questions.

## THE SEQUENCE RULES IN MORE DETAIL

In this section I shall present the classical sequence rules adumbrated at the beginning of the chapter in more detail. I shall illustrate them with examples from Classical and Archaic Latin.

### Posteriority

In Classical Latin, the expression of posteriority is relatively restricted in subjunctival clauses: forms in *-ūrus* are normally only found in indirect questions and *quīn*-clauses. Ex. 8 shows the present posterior subjunctive, Ex. 9 the past posterior subjunctive:

(8) (A rhetorical question has been asked.)

*Nōn dubitō, tū quid respōnsūrus sīs; itaque uideō, cui committam.* (Cic. *Tusc.* 5. 55.)

I *have* no *doubt* what you *will* answer, so I *see* to whom I *am* posing my question.

(9) (Cicero was certain that he would see Atticus, but the meeting did not take place.)

*Nōn fuerat* mihī dubium quīn tē Tarentī aut Brundisī uīsūrus essem. (Cic. *Att.* 3. 6. 1.)

I *had been* in no doubt that I *was going to see* you in Tarentum or Brundisium.

In Ex. 8, there are two indirect questions, both after presents. The first is posterior—giving the reply has not yet even begun—and the second is more or less simultaneous—the question has just been asked. This distinction is reflected in the use of the present posterior and present simultaneous subjunctives, respectively. In Ex. 9, the main clause verb is past, so the past posterior subjunctive is employed for the expected action in the *quīn*-clause.

Since the forms in *-ūrus* are restricted to the active, they are replaced by the present or imperfect subjunctives in the passive:

(10) (Cicero tells M. Caelius about his anxiety.)

*Mīrificē sum* sollicitus quidnam dē prōuinciīs *dēcernātur*. (Cic. *fam.* 2. 11. 1.)

I *am* exceedingly worried about what *is going to be decided* concerning the provinces.

(11) (Rabirius Postumus had given a loan to Ptolemy, thinking that he would be king again soon and that he would then be able to pay him back.)

*Erat* nēminī dubium, quīn is in rēgnū *restituērētur* ā senātū populōque Rōmānō. (Cic. *Rab. Post.* 4.)

No one *had* any doubt that he *was going to be restored* to the throne by the Roman senate and people.

Here we find the subjunctives which in the active express simultaneity used to present posterior events. In the passive, the distinction between simultaneous and posterior cannot be made. In Ex. 10 the 'present' (=non-past) subjunctive *dēcernātur* is employed after the

present in the main clause, while in Ex. 11 it is the imperfect subjunctive *restituerētur* after the imperfect *erat*.

In other types of subordinate clauses, posteriority is normally not even expressed in the active:

(12) (Orgetorix is striving for supremacy over the whole of Gaul.)

Is...cīuitātī *persuāsit*, ut dē finibus suis cum omnibus cōpiis *exīrent*. (Caes. Gall. 1. 2. 1.)

He...*persuaded* the whole community *to leave* their territory in full force.

Here it is obvious that leaving the territory takes place after being persuaded, but there is no *-ūrus*-form in the *ut*-clause, perhaps for this very reason. Another reason for not using a periphrastic subjunctive may be that there is a certain similarity between this kind of clause and main clause present subjunctives used for commands. Still, the almost complete absence of *-ūrus* forms in clause types other than indirect questions and *quīn*-clauses remains a descriptive fact that cannot always be explained by reference to special meanings.

Only occasionally are forms in *-ūrus* used in clauses other than indirect questions and *quīn*-clauses:

(13) (Knowledge without power is useless.)

Quid igitur iuuat aut quid affert ad cauendum scīre aliquid futūrum, cum id certē *futūrum sit*? (Cic. nat. deor. 3. 14.)

So what is the point in knowing that something will happen, or how does it help us in order to be on our guard, when it *will happen* unavoidably?

Here the present subjunctive *sit* would not be precise enough. The speaker wants to emphasize the futurity of the event and to exclude the present.

In Archaic Latin, periphrastic subjunctives are used even more rarely to express posteriority, as has rightly been pointed out by Bennett (1910: 334–5) and K–St ii. 180. There are few examples of posterior subjunctives in indirect questions:

(14) (Chrysalus has a cunning plan, but does not want to reveal it yet.)

*Nescīs* quid ego *āctūrus sim* neque facinus quantum exōrdiar. (Bacch. 722.)

You *do not know* what I *am going to do*, nor how great a deed I *am* beginning.

But in our three comedies, there is not a single *-ūrus*-subjunctive in indirect questions or *quīn*-clauses. This is probably due to the fact that most of the present subjunctives which could be interpreted as posterior seem to have modal nuances normally expressed by the present or the imperfect subjunctive:

(15) (A slave is looking for Euclio's gold.)

*Perscrūtābōr fānum, si inueniam uspiam  
aurum. (Aul. 620–1.)*

*I will search the shrine, if I can find the gold somewhere.*

*Inueniam* is likely to be potential.<sup>10</sup> Although I found many instances of indirect questions and *quīn*-clauses in the three plays where a periphrastic subjunctive would be possible in Classical Latin, I could not find a single one where it would have to be used.

The only example of a periphrastic subjunctive in a subordinate clause in my corpus occurs, in fact, in an *ut*-clause:

(16) (Hegio wants to meet Micio in order to see if he is going to do what he ought to.)

*Sī est, factūrus ut sīt officium suom,  
faciāt. (Ad. 514–15.)*

*If it is the case that he is going to do his duty, let him do it.*

As in Ex. 13, a simple present subjunctive in the subordinate clause would not be precise enough here because the question is not whether Micio is doing his duty now, but whether he is going to do it later.<sup>11</sup>

## Primary and Secondary Sequence

If we leave the expression of posteriority aside, there is a remarkable similarity between the sequence rules of Classical and Archaic Latin. After a non-past governing clause, anteriority is expressed by the

<sup>10</sup> Ascribing potential meaning to a subjunctive like this might be taken to imply that the non-potential indicative could have been chosen instead. There are indeed some indirect questions introduced by *sī* that are in the indicative, cf. *Eun.* 545: *uīsam sī domist*, 'I shall see if he's at home.' See also K–St ii. 426.

<sup>11</sup> Grassi (1966) discusses in detail exceptions to the sequence rules that are motivated by such semantic considerations.

perfect subjunctive<sup>12</sup> and non-anteriority by the present.<sup>13</sup> Ex. 17 is from Cicero, and Exx. 18 and 19 are from Plautus:

(17) (Cicero likens accusers to geese and dogs.)

Ānseribus cibāria pūblicē locantur et canēs aluntur in Capitōliō ut *significant* sī fūrēs *uēnerint*.<sup>14</sup> (Cic. S. Rosc. 56.)

On the Capitol, food *is provided* for the geese at public expense, and the dogs *are fed* there so that they *make it known* if thieves *have come*.

(18) (Lyco is reading out a letter addressed to him.)

Iam scīs ut *conuēnerīt*. (Curc. 435.)

You already *know* how it *has been agreed*.

(19) (A pimp is feeling unwell.)

Nīl metuō nisi nē medius *dirrumpār* miser. (Curc. 222.)

I *do not fear* anything except that I, poor chap that I am, *could burst* in the middle.

In Exx. 17 and 18, anteriority is expressed by the perfect subjunctives *uēnerint* and *conuēnerīt*. In Exx. 17 and 19, the present subjunctives *significant* and *dirrumpār* are used for non-anteriority.

In past contexts, there is backshift of tenses not only in Classical Latin, but also frequently in Archaic Latin; at the beginning of this chapter, I hypothesized that in Archaic Latin backshift occurs in three quarters of the cases where one expects it in Classical Latin. Exx. 20 and 21 present cases of anteriority and non-anteriority from Cicero, and Exx. 22 and 23 are similar, backshifted instances from Terence:

(20) (Atticus is keeping Cicero informed about what is going on in Rome.)

Ācta quae *essent* ūsque ad VIII Kal. Iūn. *cognōuī* ex tuīs litterīs. (Cic. Att. 3. 10. 1.)

I *found out* from your letters what *had been done* up to 25 May.

<sup>12</sup> There are 31 instances of this in our three plays, 20 in Plautus and 11 in Terence.

<sup>13</sup> This is the case 248 times in Plautus and 108 times in Terence, so 356 times in total.

<sup>14</sup> The subjunctive in the conditional clause seems to be the result of attraction rather than to be an independent *potentiālis*; consequently it should follow the sequence rules.

(21) (The Stoics believe that righteousness and happiness go hand in hand.)

Quī, cum ratiō *docuerit*, quod honestum *esset*, id esse solum bonum, semper sit necesse est beātus. (Cic. *fin.* 3. 75.)

Since reason *has taught* him that the only good is that which *is* (lit.: *was*) righteous, he must needs always be happy.

(22) (A slave has received praise from his master.)

Mihi, qui id *dedissem* cōsiliū, *ēgit* grātiās. (Ad. 368.)

He *thanked* me, since I *had given* this advice.

(23) (A man was afraid that his son might be in the city, amidst morally corrupting influences.)

*Metuī* ne *haerērēt* hīc. (Ad. 403.)

I *was afraid* he *would be hanging around* here.

In Exx. 20 and 21, the main clause verbs *cognōuī* and *docuerit* constitute past contexts. In Ex. 20, the subordinate clause is anterior and therefore in the pluperfect subjunctive; in Ex. 21 it is regarded as simultaneous and consequently is in the imperfect subjunctive. Ex. 21 is of special interest because there is backshift of tenses even though the relative clause refers to something that is, strictly speaking, atemporal. In English, we need the present tense here, while in Latin there is the imperfect. Exx. 22 and 23 are the Terentian equivalents of Exx. 20 and 21: in Ex. 22, *dedissem* is anterior to *ēgit*, and in Ex. 23, *haerērēt* is simultaneous with *metuī*.<sup>15</sup>

I have now outlined the most important sequence rules of Classical Latin. In the remainder of this section, I shall discuss some special points: the *cōsecūtiō* after historic presents, present perfects, non-past finite verbs with perfect infinitives, and unreal subjunctives. In each of these cases, the semantics can override the morphology, so that one can find secondary sequence after verbs that are morphologically present, and primary sequence after verbs that are morphologically past. What might look like a violation of the sequence rules from a morphological point of view, and was taken as such in my first count, is justified by the meaning.

<sup>15</sup> In past contexts, the anterior pluperfect subjunctive is used four times in Plautus and three times in Terence, and the simultaneous imperfect subjunctive is employed 33 times in Plautus and 13 times in Terence. These are 7 anterior and 46 simultaneous subjunctives in total.

## The Sequence of Tenses after Historic Presents

The historic present is morphologically a present tense, but semantically past. Thus it can have either primary or secondary sequence in Classical Latin:<sup>16</sup>

(24) (Caesar wants to know what the enemy is doing.)

Equitātumque omnem . . . *praemittit*, quī *uideant*, quās in partēs hostēs iter *faciant*. (Caes. Gall. 1. 15. 1.)

He *sends out* all the cavalry in order that they *should see* in what direction the enemy *is marching*.

(25) (Caesar reassures the inhabitants of Narbonne, who are afraid of an attack by Luciterius Cadurcus.)

Eō cum uēnisset, timentēs cōnfirmat. (Caes. Gall. 7. 4. 4.)

When he *had come* there, he *reassures* the frightened inhabitants.

In Ex. 24, the historic present *praemittit* selects another present tense (*uideant*), which in turn takes a third present (*faciant*). While there is primary sequence in Ex. 24, Ex. 25 has secondary sequence: the *cum*-clause contains the pluperfect subjunctive dependent on the historic present in the main clause.

The same sequence rules apply to Archaic Latin:

(26) (A hanger-on tells how he ran away.)

*Dēdūcō* pedēs dē lectō clam, nē mīles *sentiāt*. (Curc. 361.)

I *draw* my feet *down* from the couch secretly so that the soldier *does not notice*.

(27) (A kite has snatched some of a miser's food.)

*Infīt* ibī postulāre plōrāns, eiulāns,  
ut sibi *licērēt* mīlūom uadārier. (Aul. 318–19.)

Crying and wailing he then *begins* to demand that he *should be allowed* to summons the kite.

In Ex. 26, the historic present *dēdūcō* is followed by another present, *sentiāt*, while in Ex. 27 the present *infīt* takes secondary sequence,

<sup>16</sup> The same is true of the historic infinitive in Plautus and Terence. While in classical prose only secondary sequence is used (K–St ii. 177–8), Archaic Latin can also have primary sequence (*Merc.* 240–1, *Eun.* 619).

witness the imperfect *licērēt*. Primary sequence is found nine times in the three plays (six times in Plautus and three times in Terence), and secondary sequence occurs three times (once in Plautus and twice in Terence). These three cases can no longer be taken as ‘unexpected secondary sequence’, as they were in my initial count. Semantically, they make just as much sense as the instances of primary sequence.

### The Present Perfect with Primary Sequence

When I stated my hypothesis about the sequence in Archaic Latin, it was based on a count in which every perfect was considered a past tense. However, I argued in Ch. 2 that the perfect can refer not only to a past action, but also to a present result arising from it.<sup>17</sup> In the first case it situates an event in the past and has secondary sequence in Classical Latin, while in the second it is a true present and has primary sequence:

(28) (Cicero is talking about his philosophical works.)

Cumque fundāmentum esset philosophiae positum in finibus bonōrum et malōrum, *perpūrgātus est* is locus ā nōbīs quīnque librīs, ut, quid ā quōque, et quid contrā quemque philosophum dicerētur, intellegī *posset*. (Cic. *diu.* 2. 1.)

As the foundation of philosophy lies in assessing what is the greatest good and evil, this topic *was cleared up* by us in five books so that it *could* be seen what was said by, and what against, each philosopher.

(29) (Cotta replies to Balbus.)

‘An’ inquit ‘*oblītus es* quid initiō *dīxerim*?’ (Cic. *nat. deor.* 2. 2.)

‘Or *have you forgotten*’, he asked, ‘what I *said* initially?’

In Ex. 28, *perpūrgātus est* refers to an action of the past, hence the secondary sequence *posset*. In Ex. 29, on the other hand, *oblītus es* ‘you have forgotten’ expresses a present state and is equivalent to *nescīs* ‘you do not know’. This explains the primary sequence (*dīxerim*) in the indirect question.

In our three comedies, we also find both types of *cōnsecūtiō*. Secondary sequence occurs after perfects with past meaning:

<sup>17</sup> Perhaps the proviso should be made that Latin is less committed than English to expressing such a present result.

(30) (A soldier reproaches a banker for being tricked by a forged letter.)

Stultiōr stultō fuistī qui īs tabellis crēderēs. (*Curc.* 551.)

You *were* beyond stupid because you *trusted* these tablets.

Here *stultiōr stultō fuistī* is a judgement of the banker's misplaced trust some time ago and therefore truly past.

Ex. 31 is a Terentian instance of the governing verb being a present perfect:

(31) (Aeschinus faces the prospect of losing his girlfriend to her relative from abroad.)

Is uēnit ut sēcum āuehāt,  
nam habitāt Milētī. (*Ad.* 653–4.)

He *has come* to take her away with him; for he lives in Miletus.

*Vēnit*<sup>18</sup> 'he has come' is roughly equivalent to *adest* 'he is here'. This 'present perfect' interpretation is in fact possible in all the instances of primary sequence in my limited corpus. It is particularly obvious in *Aul.* 777–8, where *nōuistī*, which always has present meaning, governs *sim gnātus*. In the three comedies, there are twenty-two tokens of such perfects being followed by present or perfect subjunctives (ten in Plautus and twelve in Terence). This accounts for a large proportion of the cases of 'unexpected primary sequence after past verbs' in my initial count. However, outside my corpus there are instances of primary sequence after perfects that cannot easily be interpreted as being semantically present:

(32) (Laches has overheard the conversation his wife had with his son.)

Quem cum istōc sermōnem habuerīs procul hinc stāns accēpi, uxōr.  
(*Hec.* 607.)

Standing far from here I *gathered* the conversation you *have had* with that fellow, my dear.

Although Wirtzfeld (1888: 24) recognizes that *procul hinc stāns*, which is no longer true at the time of speaking, situates *accēpi* in the past, he still regards it as a present perfect. The meaning would then be 'I am in the state of having gathered the conversation while I was

<sup>18</sup> The passage is in iambic senarii, which forces us to scan *uēnit* (perfect with long root vowel) rather than *uēnīt* (present with short root vowel).

standing far from here'. This interpretation is perhaps possible, but not the most obvious solution. It seems more likely to me that this is a past perfect that fails to cause secondary sequence (*habērēs*).

This analysis is confirmed by the only example in my corpus of a finite past tense other than the perfect with primary sequence:

(33) (Euclio has been muttering to himself. Megadorus wants to know what he has been saying.)

*Megadorus*: Quid tū tē sōlus ē senātū sēuocās?

*Euclio*: Pol ego ut te *accūsem* meritō *meditābār*. (*Aul.* 549–50.)

*Megadorus*: Why are you removing yourself alone from the council? *Euclio*: Indeed, I *was considering how to accuse* you, as you deserve it.

The main clause contains the imperfect *meditābār*. Unlike the perfect, the imperfect indicative cannot have present reference. Therefore, we should expect an imperfect subjunctive dependent on it, but we find a present. There has been no backshift. This was also recognized by Bennett (1910: 340), who calls it a case of *repraesentātiō*. He does not explain what he means by *repraesentātiō*, but seems to imply that lack of backshift makes a statement more immediate and lively or that it presents the matter as unfinished. Again, Wirtzfeld's interpretation (1888: 17) is rather forced: he thinks that there is some kind of anacoluthon, with Euclio beginning in the present *accūsem* and then realizing in mid-sentence that he should be talking about the past, thus switching to the imperfect *meditābār*.

An examination of Lindsay's examples (1907: 56–7) of violation of the sequence rules shows that all but one of the instances have primary sequence in past contexts.<sup>19</sup> Compare:

(34) (Alcumena says to her husband that he himself told her about his success abroad.)

Ex te *audīui*, ut urbem maxumam

*expugnāuissēs* rēgemque Pterelam tūte *occīderīs*. (*Amph.* 745–6.)

I *heard* it from you how you *had taken* the huge city *by storm* and how you *have killed* King Pterela yourself.

<sup>19</sup> The one exception is *Persa* 537–8, where the main clause contains *faciō* and the final clause dependent on it has *facerem*. However, Woytek (1982: 341) believes that *faciō* is more or less like a historic present, in which case there is nothing special about the imperfect subjunctive. See also K–St ii. 186 for the present tense demanding secondary sequence if it refers to present and past time.

Here there is not only secondary, but also primary sequence after the main clause in the perfect. This main clause perfect cannot be interpreted as a present perfect, but only as a past tense, because it has secondary sequence in one of the two instances. Thus even though there may be fewer instances of primary sequence after true past verbs than I hypothesized, there are still some that cannot be explained away.<sup>20</sup>

### The Sequence after Non-Past Verbs with Perfect Infinitives

The next type to be discussed here is that of non-past verbs followed by perfect infinitives, for example *crēdō tē fēcisse*; what tense is a subjunctive going to be in if it depends on such a construction? Here it might be interesting to look at one of Thomas's theories (1949: 137–9). Concerning the tenses of subjunctival subordinate clauses in Classical Latin, he distinguishes between two groups. On the one hand, there are the indirect questions, final clauses, and subject or object clauses with *ut* or *nē*. This group consists of complement clauses and is supposed to follow the sequence rules quite regularly. On the other hand, there are the relative clauses (except the final ones), most adverbial clauses, whether causal, temporal, adversative, or something else, and the thematic *quod*-clauses ('concerning the fact that'). These are said to have complete autonomy of tense. While it is undoubtedly true that most clauses in the second group are more likely to have independent time reference,<sup>21</sup> I should contest the idea that they all have complete autonomy of tense. Exx. 35 and 36 are both in Thomas; neither of them seems to obey the sequence rules:

(35) (Caecina is writing to Cicero. He had attacked Caesar verbally.)

Filius, ut audiō, pertimuit . . . , nē ea rēs ineptē mihi nocēret, cum praesertim adhūc stilī poenās *dem*. (Cic. *fam.* 6. 7. 1.)

My son, I gather, has become afraid that this matter *might harm* me in a stupid way, especially since I *am* still *paying* the penalty for my pen.

<sup>20</sup> Perhaps we could argue that Plautus uses the perfect subjunctive instead of the pluperfect in order to show that this action took place after the one presented in the pluperfect.

<sup>21</sup> In fact, thematic *quod*-clauses always have independent time reference, cf. below.

(36) (The previous advocates are said to have had talent.)

*Laudantur* ōrātōrēs ueterēs, Crassī illī et Antōnii, quod crīmina diluere dilucidē, quod cōpiōsē reōrum causās dēfendere solērent. (Cic. Verr. ii. 2. 191.)<sup>22</sup>

The old orators *are praised*, the likes of Crassus and Antonius, because they *used* to refute accusations lucidly and *to* defend the affairs of the accused copiously.

The *cum*-clause in Ex. 35 does indeed have independent time reference; it is set in relation to the moment of speech. In this way, Caecina presents the clause as his own and shows that he agrees with his son's assessment of the situation; the imperfect *darem* would simply present the clause as spoken by his son and would leave it open whether Caecina himself agreed. Ex. 36 is different. One past tense or other is required by the subject-matter, so there is no choice between a present and a perfect; the choice is between *solērent*, which we find here, and *solitī sint*, the form one might expect from the rules. The imperfect takes us back to the time when the orators were helping others, while the perfect would simply summarize their achievements.

Thomas's concept of greater autonomy of some clauses is also relevant for explaining the sequence after non-past finite verbs with perfect infinitives. In such contexts, we find both secondary and primary sequence in Classical Latin:

(37) (The war against Mithridates is dangerous and requires an experienced man—Pompey.)

Satis mihi multa uerba *fēcisse uideor*, quārē *esset* hoc bellum genere ipsō necessārium, magnitudīne periculōsum. (Cic. Manil. 27.)

I *think* I *have said* enough why this war *is* (lit.: *was*) necessary in its nature and dangerous in its magnitude.

(38) (Verres is a shameless individual.)

Quid huic sacri umquam fore aut quid religiōsi *fuisse putātis* quī nunc tantō scelere sē opstrictum esse nōn *sentiat*? (Cic. Verr. ii. 4. 71.)

What *do* you *think* will ever be sacred or *has been* holy to him, a man who *does not realize* now that he is guilty of so great a crime?

<sup>22</sup> I am following the Oxford edition here. In his Teubner text, Klotz prints *laudābantur*, which does not have any manuscript support.

The subordinate clause in Ex. 37 is set in relation to the perfect infinitive. It follows the secondary sequence because as an indirect question it is semantically dependent on the past infinitive. Thus the past simultaneous imperfect subjunctive *esset* is used, even though the statement is still true at the time of speaking. By contrast, the relative clause in Ex. 38 is more independent and is set in relation to the moment of speech rather than to the past infinitive; see also the use of *nunc* in this example. It is simultaneous with the moment of speech and therefore has the present subjunctive.

In our three comedies there are five tokens where such perfect infinitives are followed by secondary sequence.<sup>23</sup> In each of them, the tense of the subjunctive is naturally determined by the infinitive, while independent time reference would not make much sense:

(39) (The miserly Euclio has just promised his daughter to Megadorus.)

Illud facito ut *meminerīs*  
*conuēnisse* ut nē quid dōtis mea<sup>24</sup> ad te *afferrēt* filia. (Aul. 257–8.)

Take care you *remember* that it *was agreed* that my daughter *should* not bring any dowry to you.

*Meminerīs*, as always, counts as non-past. The clause introduced by *ut nē* semantically depends on *conuēnisse*, hence the secondary sequence.

But there are also two examples, both of them in Plautus, in which there are present subjunctives:

(40) (Eunomia promises to help her son.)

*Scīs tūte facta uelle mē quae tū uelīs.* (Aul. 686.)

You *know* that I *want* the things *done* that you *want*.

(41) (Lyconides has raped Euclio's daughter. Now he comes up with a silly excuse.)

*Lyconides:* Dēōs crēdō uoluisse; nam nī uellent, nōn fierēt, sciō.

*Euclio:* At egō dēōs crēdō uoluisse ut apud mē te in neruo ēnicem.

(Aul. 742–3.)

<sup>23</sup> Four of them are in Plautus, one is in Terence.

<sup>24</sup> There is probably complete elision rather than iambic shortening of the type *mē(a) ād*.

*Lyconides*: I believe the gods wanted it; for if they hadn't wanted it, I know it wouldn't have happened. *Euclio*: But I *believe* the gods *wanted* that I *kill* you in fetters in my house.

The relative clause in Ex. 40 does not really violate the classical rules of sequence, regardless of whether it is semantically dependent on or independent of the perfect infinitive.<sup>25</sup> The reason is that *facta* refers to a present result, 'that they *are done*', and so the primary sequence is not surprising. But *uoluisse* in *Euclio*'s reply in Ex. 41 is clearly not a present perfect; this can also be seen from the neat parallelism to *Lyconides*' *dēōs crēdō uoluisse*, which must refer to the past. According to Thomas, object clauses with *ut* are highly dependent on their governing verbs, so the tense of the subjunctive ought to be determined by the infinitive *uoluisse*. Consequently we should expect *ēnicārem* instead of *ēnicem*. However, there is no backshift of tenses here. The explanation of *ēnicem* must be that it conveys greater immediacy than the imperfect subjunctive.

In my initial count, both Ex. 40 and Ex. 41 were among the cases of 'unexpected primary sequence'. I must now modify my initial analysis: primary sequence can be motivated semantically in Ex. 40 and is, in fact, the only possibility, while it remains unexpected in Ex. 41.

### Superordinate Clauses with Unreal Meaning

The sequence after superordinate verbs in the unreal subjunctive is of special interest because there are some discrepancies between Archaic and Classical Latin. The reason for the differences lies partly, but not exclusively, in the fact that the tenses expressing the *irreālis* are not always the same in Archaic and Classical Latin.

Before looking at clauses dependent on the *irreālis*, I have to present the most frequent potential and unreal types in Early and Classical Latin. Table 3.3 does this for Classical Latin. Here we can see what subjunctives are used for the *potentiālis* and the *irreālis* in Classical Latin.<sup>26</sup> Regardless of whether these subjunctives occur in main or conditional clauses, their tense is chosen independently

<sup>25</sup> Synchronically, the participle here is best analysed as an elliptical perfect passive infinitive, although diachronically it is part of an older construction, the acc. with *praedicatīuum*.

<sup>26</sup> A similar table can be found in Menge, Burkard, and Schauer (2000: 818).

TABLE 3.3. *Potentiālis* and *irreālis* in Classical Latin

| Potential, 'you would do' | Unreal with present reference, 'you would be doing' | Unreal with past reference, 'you would have done' |
|---------------------------|---|---|
| <i>faciās/fēcerīs</i>     | <i>facerēs</i>                                      | <i>fēcissēs</i>                                   |

of the *cōsecūtiō*.<sup>27</sup> Looking at conditional clauses in Classical Latin, Trost (1939) explains the difference between indicative (not in my table) and subjunctive as that between *reālis* and hypothetical, and, among the subjunctives, the difference between present and imperfect tense as that between *potentiālis* and *irreālis*. Despite its name, the *reālis* does not presuppose or entail that the event is actually realized, but simply leaves it open; *sī facis* 'if you do' does not necessarily mean that you do something. Both *potentiālis* and *irreālis* present events as hypothetical, the fulfilment being regarded in the former case as less likely than is the case for the *reālis*. Again, potential *sī faciās* 'if you should do' leaves the realization open, but the unreal *sī facerēs* 'if you were to do (but you will not be able to)' is used when the realization is considered impossible. The difference between *sī facerēs* and *sī fēcissēs* is that *sī facerēs* has present reference, while *sī fēcissēs* has past reference. *Sī facerēs* means 'if you were to do x (but you are not doing it)', and *sī fēcissēs* means 'if you had done x (but you have not done it)'.

It should be emphasized that the choice between *reālis* and *potentiālis* on the one hand, and between *potentiālis* and *irreālis* on the other, is not completely determined by extra-linguistic factors. Often, one and the same event can be presented in more than one way:

(42) (Demosthenes would not have been able to speak if only Plato had listened to him. Cicero asks Brutus if he would be able to do so.)

Quid tū, Brūte? *Possēs*ne, sī tē ut Cūriōnem quondam contiō *reliquisset*? (Cic. *Brut.* 192.)

How about you, Brutus? *Would you be able* to speak if the assembly *had left* you, as it had once left Curio?

<sup>27</sup> The exception is the *potentiālis* in subordinate clauses. In main clauses there is no temporal difference between *faciās* and *fēcerīs* 'you might do' (note the frequent *dīcat quis* and *dixerit quis*). In conditional clauses, however, the present tense expresses simultaneity ('if you should do'), and the perfect expresses anteriority to a present or future event ('if you should have done').

(43) (Brutus replies to Cicero's question.)

Egō uērō, inquit ille, ut mē tibi indicem, in eīs etiam causīs, in quibus omnis rēs nōbīs cum iūdicibus est, nōn cum populō, tamen sī ā corōnā *relictus sim*, nōn *queam* dicere. (Cic. *Brut.* 192.)

'To be frank with you', he said, 'even in those trials in which we only have to do with the judges, not with the people, I *should* not *be able* to speak if I *had been left alone* by my audience.'

Both examples refer to the same imaginary situation in which Brutus is left to his own devices. Cicero politely presents this situation as counterfactual, as something which could not take place in real life. Brutus, on the other hand, is modest and uses the potential subjunctive, thus stating that the situation is imagined, but possible. In both Ex. 42 and Ex. 43, the tenses of the subjunctives make it clear whether a potential or unreal interpretation is intended.

The situation is more complicated in Archaic Latin, as can be seen from Table 3.4. There is no one-to-one relationship between form and meaning. *Faciās* can be either potential or unreal, and *facerēs* can be either unreal with present reference, or unreal with past reference.<sup>28</sup> Nevertheless, it still makes sense to distinguish between potential and unreal: while the unreal 'you would do *x*' can be rendered as *faciās* or *facerēs*, the potential 'you might do *x*' can only be translated as *faciās/fēceris*, never as *facerēs*. Similarly, in the *irreālis* we should differentiate between present and past reference. Both can be rendered as *facerēs*, yet only the former can be translated as *faciās*, and only the latter as *fēcissēs*.

In Archaic Latin, the meaning makes it obvious in most cases whether we are dealing with a *potentiālis* or an *irreālis*. But sometimes the meaning is not clear; and unlike in Classical Latin, the form may then not be a great help either. Sometimes we even find present and imperfect subjunctives next to each other without any difference in meaning—in *Aul.* 523 both are unreal with present reference: *compellārem ego illum, nī metuam*, 'I should address him, if I were not afraid.'<sup>29</sup> Here *metuam* in the conditional clause is an

<sup>28</sup> See Hettrich (1992: 274), who argues that originally there were only real and hypothetical conditional clauses; in Archaic Latin, the split of the hypothetical clauses into potential and unreal ones is not yet complete.

<sup>29</sup> The difference in tense is certainly not due to the fact that *compellārem* refers to an action and *metuam* to a state.

TABLE 3.4. *Potentiālis* and *irreālis* in Archaic Latin

| Potential, 'you would do' | Unreal with present reference, 'you would be doing' | Unreal with past reference, 'you would have done' |
|---------------------------|---|---|
| <i>faciās/feceris</i>     | <i>faciās/facerēs</i>                               | <i>facerēs/fēcissēs</i>                           |

independent unreal subjunctive; this meaning could also be expressed by *metuerem*.<sup>30</sup> So while the distinctions between *potentiālis*, *irreālis* with present reference, and *irreālis* with past reference are important in theory, they are from time to time impossible to draw in practice.

I now turn to those clauses in my corpus that depend on unreal subjunctives. I have only considered those twenty-one cases in which the verb must be in the subjunctive anyway, for example because the clause is introduced by *quīn*, regardless of whether or not the subordinate clauses have unreal meaning themselves. Since it cannot always be determined if the subordinate clause has unreal meaning as well, in which case the tense of the subjunctive could have been chosen on independent grounds, I took all the tokens as 'expected to follow the sequence' in my initial count.

The unreal subjunctive with past reference ('I would have done') naturally demands secondary sequence both in Archaic Latin and in the classical language because it is always semantically and formally past. One example from Plautus should suffice:

(44) (A pimp was only prevented from prostituting one of his girls because he was ill.)

Nam si is ualuisse, iam prīdem quōquō *possēt mitterēt*. (*Curc.* 700.)

For if he had been well, he *would have sent* you wherever he *could* long ago.

Here the wider context—the girl is now free—and *iam prīdem* show that *mitterēt* has past, not present reference. Consequently the imperfect subjunctive of the secondary sequence (*possēt*) is used in the dependent clause. From the context it seems to receive some unreal colouring as well.<sup>31</sup>

<sup>30</sup> Admittedly, the combination of a conditional clause in the present subjunctive and a main clause in the imperfect subjunctive is unusual. However, there is a parallel in *Truc.* 830, *nam uīnum sī fābulārī possīt, sē dēfenderēt*, 'for the wine would defend itself, if it could speak.'

<sup>31</sup> We find the unreal subjunctive with past reference governing the imperfect subjunctive twice in Plautus and four times in Terence.

The situation is more complicated after the unreal subjunctive with present reference. In Classical Latin, it is in the imperfect tense, so that even though it is semantically present, it is morphologically past. Subordinate clauses generally follow the secondary sequence:

(45) (The nature of the gods is such that it should cause reverence, not fear.)

*Sī nihil aliud quaererēmus nisi ut deōs piē colerēmus et ut superstitiōne liberārēmur, satis erat dictum; nam et praestāns deōrum nātūra hominum pietāte colerētur, cum et aeterna esset et beātissima . . . , et metus omnis ā uī atque irā deōrum pulsus esset. (Cic. nat. deor. 1. 45.)*

If all we *were* looking for *was* to honour the gods piously and *to be freed* from superstition, enough would have been said. For the exalted nature of the gods *would be honoured* by the piety of mankind because it *is* (lit.: *was*) eternal and most blessed . . . , and all fear of the gods' power and anger would have been driven out.

Menge, Burkard, and Schauer (2000: 641) rightly claim that the unreal subjunctive with present reference selects secondary sequence because it is formally in a past tense. In Ex. 45, it could admittedly be argued that *colerēmus* and *liberārēmur* might be given an unreal interpretation, and that this is the true reason for the imperfect subjunctive. But *esset* can on no account be regarded as unreal. The only explanation for this imperfect subjunctive is that *colerētur* in the main clause, though being semantically present, is morphologically past, and that form outweighs meaning here.

In Archaic Latin, on the other hand, the unreal subjunctive with present reference is not restricted to the imperfect, but can be in the present tense as well. If there is an *irreālis* with present reference in the main clause, there are four attested ways of combining the tenses of the superordinate with those of the subordinate clauses:

1. Superordinate clause = present subjunctive, subordinate clause = primary sequence, as in Ex. 46; this occurs ten times in our three comedies, seven times in Plautus and three times in Terence.
2. Superordinate clause = present subjunctive, subordinate clause = apparently secondary sequence, as in Ex. 47; there are no instances in our three plays, but Ex. 47 represents this type.

3. Superordinate clause = imperfect subjunctive, subordinate clause = primary sequence, as in Ex. 48; for this we have one example in *Ad.*, namely Ex. 48.
4. Superordinate clause = imperfect subjunctive, subordinate clause = secondary sequence, as in Ex. 47. Again, all four instances in our three comedies are found in Terence.

For type 1 see:

(46) (Megadorus believes that it would be good if women were not allowed to have dowries.)

Hoc sī ita fiāt, mōrēs meliōrēs sibi

*parent, prō dōte quōs ferant, quam nunc ferunt.* (*Aul.* 492–3.)

If that were to happen, they *would provide* themselves with better behaviour than<sup>32</sup> now, which they *could bring* instead of a dowry.

Here the subjunctive *ferant* can be explained in two ways that are not mutually exclusive: it could be the result of the relative clause being restrictive and characterizing (type *sunt quī dīcant*) and thus following the *cōsecūtiō*; or it could be the result of a potential or unreal nuance, in which case its tense would be independent.

Types 2 and 4 are exemplified by Ex. 47; type 2 does not occur in our three comedies:

(47) (Pamphilus is desperate because his father has just told him that he has to marry today.)

Quod si egō rescīsem id prius, quid *facерem* sīquīs nunc mē rogēt:  
aliquid *facерem* ut hoc nē *facерem*. (*Andr.* 258–9.)

If anyone now *asked* me what I *would be doing* if I'd known about it before, (*namely*) I *would be doing* something so as to *avoid doing* it. (transl. Barsby 2001: i. 75)

*Sīquīs nunc mē rogēt* is an unreal or potential pseudo-conditional clause,<sup>33</sup> and *quid facерem* is an indirect question dependent on it. As *rogēt* is present both semantically and morphologically, the classical

<sup>32</sup> *Quam* introduces a comparative clause, not a relative clause referring to *dōte*, see Lodge (1933: 415).

<sup>33</sup> Pseudo-conditional clauses do not tell us under what circumstances their main clauses are true, but under what conditions they are relevant. In other words, a pseudo-conditional clause may look like a regular conditional clause, but does not present the conditions under which the main clause action is realized.

rules of sequence cannot explain the imperfect subjunctive *facere*m in the first line. But *facere*m is an unreal subjunctive with present reference as well, and under these circumstances Plautus and Terence simply have a choice between present and imperfect subjunctive. The tense choice is independent of the *cōnsecūtiō*, and there could be free variation. In the second line the unreal subjunctive in the main clause, *facere*m, is an imperfect subjunctive with present reference. It has secondary sequence. However, the subjunctive in the *ut nē*-clause could have some *irreālis* meaning as well and could consequently also be independent.

*Hec.* 532 belongs to the same type: the unreal imperfect subjunctive *praeoptārēs* depends on the present infinitive of exclamation *esse*. The infinitive is timeless ('fancy being'), preferred to *fuisse* as indicating a permanent characteristic, but is given historic sequence because this characteristic was manifested in the past. Perhaps this is what Allardice (1929: 71) means when he says that the infinitive 'may have Imperf. force here'.

Wirtzfeld (1888: 33) thinks that the difference between types 3 and 4 is that between *reālis* and *irreālis*; the primary sequence is supposed to be employed if the event in the subordinate clause is thought of as real, the secondary sequence if it is thought of as unreal. This distinction does not seem to be valid, or at least it cannot be proved, as can be seen from Ex. 48 (= type 3) and Ex. 49 (= type 4):

(48) (Geta is angry and would like to punish Syrus.)

Capite in terrā statuerem,  
ut cerebrō *dispergāt* uiam. (*Ad.* 316–17.)

I *would put* him on the ground with his head so that he *spattered/would spatter* his brains on the street.

(49) (Demea is angry with Syrus.)

Tūn sī meus essēs ...  
... *exemplo*<sup>34</sup> omnibus  
*cūrārem* ut essēs. (*Ad.* 770–2.)

<sup>34</sup> I do not see why Kauer and Lindsay have not adopted Bentley's obvious correction *exemplō*, but read *exempla*.

If you were mine, I *would take care* that you *are/would be* an example for everybody.

The subordinate clauses in Exx. 48 and 49 do not differ in their truth values. It is not clear whether there is free variation or whether the two tenses are used for different effects. It is possible that the present subjunctive is employed to convey greater immediacy. It is also possible that the imperfect subjunctive has to be used in Ex. 49 because the two events are so closely linked that the same tense is used in both.<sup>35</sup> We could take Ex. 48 as an instance of violation of the classical *cōnsecūtiō*, but even if we do, it is the only one after unreal subjunctives in our corpus.

Now that I have examined those clauses that can be expected to follow the sequence rules, I can turn to clause types whose subjunctives are independent, and which are thus outside the scope of the *cōnsecūtiō*.

## SUBORDINATE CLAUSES WITH INDEPENDENT SUBJUNCTIVES

In Classical Latin, the rules for the sequence of tenses do not apply across the board to each and every type of subordinate clauses.<sup>36</sup> Some of them regularly violate the *cōnsecūtiō* for specific semantic reasons, for example the type *quod sciam*. When the main clause verb is past, *quod sciam* is not backshifted to the imperfect. Consequently it makes sense to regard the present tense in *quod sciam* as independent also in those cases where the main clause verb is not in the past, and where at first sight the sequence seems to be followed. As far as I can see from the three comedies, clause types like this behave in the same way in Archaic Latin. I shall therefore exclude them from my statistics.

<sup>35</sup> Many languages would in fact code this as a single event and express the causativity with a suffix.

<sup>36</sup> For obvious reasons, main clauses do not follow any sequence rules. There are 258 in my corpus, 137 in Plautus and 121 in Terence. My corpus contains 141 subjunctives from subordinate clause types that do not, or not always, follow the sequence of tenses in Archaic and Classical Latin; 84 of them occur in Plautus and 57 in Terence.

I shall first look at the various potential and unreal clause types. After this, I shall discuss the consecutive *ut*, pseudo-final clauses, and other subordinate clauses that specify speech acts rather than the content of utterances.

### Conditional and Other Hypothetical Clauses

I claimed above that conditional clauses, even though they are subordinate, have potential or unreal subjunctives that are independent. Their tenses are not determined by the main clause verbs, and intuitively these subjunctives seem to be on a par with main clause subjunctives, where such potential or unreal interpretations are frequent as well.<sup>37</sup> In this section, I shall merely substantiate my claim that unreal subjunctives are independent of the sequence rules with some examples. Compare:

(50) (Without his power as a consul, Cicero would not have been able to help the state.)

Quid facere *potuisssem*, nisi tum cōsul *fuissem*? (Cic. *rep.* 1. 10.)

What *could* I *have done* if I *had not been* consul at that time?

Here both main and subordinate clause are in the pluperfect subjunctive to express the *irreālis* with past reference. If conditional clauses followed the sequence rules, we should have *nisi...essem* because being a consul is simultaneous with the main clause, and certainly not over before it. Ex. 44 above is similar: *sī...ualuissēt, ...mitterēt*, ‘if he had been well, he would have sent you’ (*Curc.* 700). Both clauses have past unreal meaning. Again, if the conditional clause followed the *cōsecutiō*, we should expect the simultaneous imperfect subjunctive because the conditional clause cannot be anterior.

All conditional clauses with independent subjunctives will have to be excluded from my final statistics. There are seventy-one potential or unreal subjunctives in conditional clauses in the three plays. Of these seventy-one tokens, forty-five are in Plautus and twenty-six in

<sup>37</sup> Müller-Wetzel (2001: 71) also draws a distinction between subjunctives in main and conditional clauses on the one hand and those in subordinate clauses on the other. Subjunctives have different properties in these two contexts. (For a review of Müller-Wetzel see de Melo 2002a.)

Terence. Sometimes, however, the subjunctive can simply be regarded as the result of modal attraction or indirect speech, as in *Curc.* 29 (... *ne id quod amēs populus sī sciāt, tibi sīt probrō*, ‘in order that your love affair is not a disgrace for you when people know about it’). Here the subjunctive in the conditional clause may have independent potential meaning, but it can equally well be interpreted as due to attraction, just like *amēs* in the preceding relative clause.<sup>38</sup> I have classified such cases as subjunctives following the sequence of tenses.

Potential and unreal subjunctives are of course not restricted to conditional clauses. Those subordinate clauses that would be in the indicative if they did not have this meaning naturally behave like conditional clauses and are independent of the *cōnsecūtiō* in Classical and Archaic Latin. Consequently they will be excluded from my final count.<sup>39</sup>

### Hypothetical Clauses Dependent on Subordinators Selecting the Subjunctive

If hypothetical clauses depend on *ut* or the like, they are not subject to the sequence rules and cannot count in my final statistics. In both Classical and Archaic Latin, they keep that tense of the subjunctive which they would have if they were syntactically independent.<sup>40</sup> The reason for this is that the semantic independence remains even though the syntactic independence is lost. The semantic independence can be seen very clearly in those cases where we find tenses that would breach the *cōnsecūtiō* if they were subject to it, as in Ex. 51 from Cicero or Ex. 52 from Terence:

<sup>38</sup> If *sciāt* is in the subjunctive just because of attraction, Palinurus is (from his master’s point of view) dismayingly open to the possibility that all and sundry will find out. The potential subjunctive would be more polite.

<sup>39</sup> Of the fifteen tokens in our three comedies, ten are in Plautus and five in Terence.

<sup>40</sup> Allardice (1929: 70–1) has two different headings, one for the imperfect subjunctive after a present indicative, and the other for the imperfect subjunctive after a present infinitive. In both cases, however, the rationale behind the imperfect subjunctives is the same: it is used for the *irreālis*.

(51) (Cicero is recommending L. Egnatius.)

Tanta mihi cum eō necessitūdō *est* familiāritāsque ut, sī mea rēs *esset*, nōn magis *labōrārem*. (Cic. *fam.* 13. 44.)

I *have* such a close relationship and friendship with him that I *would* not *exert* myself more if it *were* my own affair.

(52) (Chaerea is meeting his friend Antipho.)

Nēmōst hominum quem ego nunc magis *cuperem* uidēre quam tē.  
(*Eun.* 561.)

There *is* no one whom I *would* now *wish* to see more than you.

In Ex. 51, we should expect *sit* and *labōrem* from the sequence rules. However, the unreal subjunctive with present reference regularly has the imperfect tense in Classical Latin, and the need to express this meaning overrides the need to follow the *cōnsecūtiō*. Similarly, the relative clause in Ex. 52 is restrictive and characterizing, so it is normal to find a subjunctive. But the sequence rules would demand a present subjunctive after the present in the main clause. There is unreal meaning here as well. Since the unreal subjunctive with present reference can be either in the present or in the imperfect in Archaic Latin, we might wonder whether the imperfect has been chosen in order to make it clear that the subjunctive is unreal and not just the result of the clause being restrictive and characterizing. This appears not to be the case:

(53) (A slave says that the situation is desperate.)

Nunc illud *est* quom, si omnia omnēs sua cōnsilia *cōnferant*  
atque hūc malō salūtem *quaerant*, auxili nīl *afferant*. (*Ad.* 299–300.)

Now we *are* in a situation where, if everybody in the world *put* their heads together and *tried to find* a solution to the problem . . . , they *wouldn't be able to help* at all. (transl. Barsby 2001: ii. 285.)

Here there are three unreal present tense subjunctives, *cōnferant*, *quaerant*, and *afferant*. Each of them could be replaced by the imperfect subjunctive without changing the meaning. The present tense is what we should expect from the *cōnsecūtiō* rules, while the imperfect tense would violate them and would show the independence of the subjunctives more clearly. In the light of Ex. 52, it seems that all such hypothetical subjunctives are independent, and that the variation

between their tenses cannot be predicted from the superordinate verbs.

The other two unreal subjunctives in syntactic dependence in our corpus are also in *Ad.* In *Ad.* 273, the governing verb is the past infinitive *redisse*, and the two dependent unreal subjunctives with present reference are in the imperfect. Thus the tense of the subjunctives looks as if it were the result of the sequence rules; but because of my examples above I prefer to treat the tense as having been chosen independently of the main clause tense.

### Consecutive *ut*

I shall now turn to the seven subordinate clauses, all in Terence, which are introduced by the so-called '*ut cōnsecūtīuum*' or 'consecutive *ut*'. The semantic difference between consecutive *ut* ('so that') and final *ut* ('in order that') is that the former presents an event merely as a consequence of the main clause action, while the latter marks it as an intended consequence. This semantic distinction is reflected in the use of different negatives: when consecutive *ut* is negated, it is *ut nōn*, with the factual negative *nōn*;<sup>41</sup> when final *ut* is negated, it is *ut nē* or simply *nē*, with the deontic negative *nē*.<sup>42</sup>

In Classical Latin, consecutive *ut*-clauses need not obey the sequence rules: in a past context, the consecutive *ut*-clause can have secondary sequence like a final clause, or primary sequence:

(54) (Laelius Sapiens crushed the Lusitanian Viriathus' power.)

Quem C. Laelius, is quī Sapiēns ūsurpātur, praetor frēgit et comminuit ferōcitatēque eius ita repressit, ut facile bellum reliquīs trāderet. (Cic. off. 2. 40.)

In his praetorship, Gaius Laelius, the one who is known as 'the Wise', crushed and broke him and checked his fierceness to such an extent that he left an easy war to his successors.

<sup>41</sup> *Vt nēmō* and *ut nihil* are also possible; *nēmō* and *nihil* are neutral with regard to the distinction between factual and deontic.

<sup>42</sup> *Nē* on its own, at first perhaps felt to be elliptical, spread at the expense of *ut nē*. *Vt nōn* could of course not be replaced by simple *nōn*, since otherwise its clause would have ceased to be subordinate.

(55) (Cicero is mocking Verres' journeys in a comfortable litter.)

In quibus (sc. itineribus) eō ūsque sē *praebebāt* patientem atque impigrum, ut eum nēmō umquam in equō sedentem *uiderit*. (Cic. Verr. ii. 5. 27.)

In these (sc. travels) he *showed* himself so indefatigable and strenuous that no one *has ever seen* him on horseback.

Ex. 54 follows the sequence rules, Ex. 55 does not do so. In Ex. 54, the *ut*-clause is regarded as a past consequence that no longer applies to the present situation, so the past verb of the main clause is followed by secondary sequence. In Ex. 55, on the other hand, the result is presented from the present perspective since we can now see that the result is really true. This is why the primary sequence is used.<sup>43</sup>

The same rules apply to Archaic Latin:

(56) (Nicobulus is angry with himself.)

Adeōn mē *fuisse* fungum ut qui illi *crēderem*? (Bacch. 283.)

Can I *have been* so weak in the head as to *believe* him?

(57) (In a letter to his father, a young man says that Chrysalus made him a better man.)

Quaeso ut sat habeās id, pater, quod Chrȳsalus  
me *obiūrigāuit* plūrumīs uerbīs malīs,  
et mē meliōrem *fēcit* praeceptīs suīs,  
ut te ēi habēre grātiām aequom *sīt* bonam. (Bacch. 1019–22.)

I ask you to consider it enough, father, that Chrysalus *has scolded* me with many hard words and *has made* me a better man by his admonitions, so that it is right for you to be grateful to him.

In Ex. 56, the consecutive *ut*-clause contains the imperfect subjunctive and thus presents the event as a past consequence without connection to the present situation. In Ex. 57, the *ut*-clause contains the present subjunctive. There could in theory be three reasons for this: the perfects could be present perfects, or they could be past perfects failing to cause backshift, or the consequence could be presented from

<sup>43</sup> Of course the *ut*-clause need not contain a primary perfect; a primary present is equally possible: *in eōdem tanta prūdētia fuit...*, *ut hodiē stet Asia Lūcullī īnstitūtīs seruandīs*, 'there was such prudence in this same man ... that today Asia Minor stands firm by observing Lucullus' regulations' (Cic. ac. 2. 3). The superordinate perfect is not resultative.

the present viewpoint. The first alternative seems unlikely because resultative perfects would mean that Chrysalus was in the state of having rebuked and improved the man, but the sentence is about the man, not about Chrysalus.<sup>44</sup> So unless there is simply lack of backshift, Ex. 57 is a parallel for Ex. 55 and shows the present results of a past action.

If the main clause is not situated in the past, it is normally only the present and perfect subjunctives that can stand in the *ut*-clause, unless there are special reasons for another tense, as the unreal meaning in Ex. 52 above. In all seven examples from our three plays, the main clause verb is non-past and has primary sequence. Still, the fact that such subjunctives can sometimes have independent time reference means that they had better be left out of account as far as the *cōnsecūtiō temporum* is concerned, even though they seem to follow it.

### Pseudo-Final Clauses

I can now turn to the pseudo-final clauses. Like final clauses proper, they are introduced by *ut*, or *ut nē/nē* when negated. The following two sentences illustrate the difference between truly final and pseudo-final clauses:

(58) (Scipio speaks about the reasons for introducing the *interrēgnum*.)

Prūdenter illī prīncipēs nouam et inaudītā cēterīs gentibus interrēgnī ineundī ratiōnem *excōgitāuērunt*, ut quoad certus rēx dēclārātus esset, nec sine rēge ciuitās nec diuturnō rēge *esset* ūnō. (Cic. *rep.* 2. 23.)

In their wisdom, those leading men *invented* a system that was new and unheard of among the other peoples—that of beginning an *interrēgnum*—in order that, until a permanent king had been declared, the state *would be* neither without a king nor with one single king for a long time.

(59) (Rhetoric is essential for civilization.)

Vt uērō iam ad illa summa *ueniāmus*, quae uīs alia *potuit* aut dispersōs hominēs ūnum in locum congregāre aut ā ferā agrestīque uītā ad hunc

<sup>44</sup> In Latin, resultative perfects normally describe the state of the subject, not of the object.

hūmānum cultum cīuilemque dēdūcere aut iam cōstitūtīs cīuitātibus lēgēs iūdicia iūra dēscribere? (Cic. *de orat.* 1. 33.)

But in order to *come* to our chief points, what other force *could* have assembled scattered men in one single place, or *could* have led them from an animal-like, uncivilized life to our present culture and civilization, or, when states had already been established, *could* have put down laws, justice, and rights?

In Ex. 58, the *ut*-clause is a true purpose clause. It specifies the reasons why the leading men invented the *interrēnum*. Such clauses are highly dependent on their governing clauses and obey the sequence rules. By contrast, the *ut*-clause in Ex. 59 does not follow the sequence rules, otherwise there would be an imperfect subjunctive. Ex. 59 is not a final clause proper. It does not tell us the purpose of what is going on in the main clause. Instead, it gives us the reason for uttering it. H-S 535 suggest that this clause type depends on *hoc tibi dīcō* 'I tell you this' or the like, which is to be understood from the context. At first sight, this seems to be an appealing solution because it can explain the present tense subjunctive. However, I doubt whether it is the correct one, unless it is merely taken as a shorthand formulation for 'this subordinate clause refers to the speech act and is not a true purpose clause'. Brown and Yule (1983: 1) differentiate between a 'transactional' function of language, which serves the expression of content, and an 'interactional' function, which is involved in stating personal attitudes and the like.<sup>45</sup> Truly final clauses are 'transactional', content-oriented, and follow the sequence of tenses. By contrast, pseudo-final clauses inform us about the purpose of saying something; they are 'interactional' speech act modifications and always linked to the speaker as the deictic centre. Consequently pseudo-final clauses can be expected to be in the present subjunctive, even if the main clause they modify is past.

The negative equivalent of such pseudo-final *ut*-clauses can be seen in *Haut.* 269–70: *hoc primum, ut nē quid huius rērum ignōrēs: anus, quae est dicta māter esse ei antehāc, nōn fuit*, 'lest you be ignorant of any of this, I'll say this first: the old woman who was earlier on said

<sup>45</sup> Such a distinction is drawn in several language theories. In Functional Grammar a difference is made between a 'representational layer' corresponding to the transactional function, and an 'interpersonal layer' similar to the interactional function.

to be her mother was not her mother.' Pascucci (1961: 128–9) treats *Amph.* 330 as prohibitive: *uix incēdo inānis, ne ire posse cum onere exīstumēs*. In the light of the examples with *ut* or *ut nē*, this does not seem to be the ideal solution. I regard such cases as ambiguous. They could be prohibitions ('I can barely walk empty-handed; don't think I can walk with a burden') or pseudo-final clauses ('lest you think that I can walk with a burden: I can barely walk empty-handed').<sup>46</sup> Only under special conditions is the ambiguity removed, for example when there is *ut nē* instead of simple *nē*.<sup>47</sup>

In our three comedies, there are nineteen relevant tokens, fifteen in Plautus and four in Terence.<sup>48</sup> All the main clauses have present reference, so at first sight it might look as if the clauses obeyed the *cōnsecūtiō* rules. However, just as in Classical Latin, pseudo-final clauses always have independent time reference in Archaic Latin:

(60) (Agorastocles tells a Carthaginian that they are compatriots.)

Carthāgini ego sum gnātus, ut tū sīs sciēns. (*Poen.* 1038.)

Just to let you know, I was born in Carthage.

Here the main clause clearly has past reference. The *ut*-clause in the present would violate the classical sequence rules if it were truly final; but since it is pseudo-final, it is simply outside the scope of the sequence rules. Consequently I must leave the nineteen relevant tokens in the three plays out of my final statistics.

At the end of this discussion of pseudo-final clauses it should at least be mentioned that H–S 642 describe the following type as rhetorical pseudo-final clauses: *inde . . . nē quandō ā metū ac periculīs uacārent, pestilentia ingēns orta* (*Liu.* 7. 1. 7), 'lest they should ever be free from fear and dangers, a great pestilence broke out afterwards.' This type obeys the sequence rules and is, in my opinion, truly final. The special rhetorical effect comes about by presenting negative,

<sup>46</sup> Prohibitions will be discussed in Ch. 4.

<sup>47</sup> Not all subordinate clauses modifying the speech act are final. Other subjunctival types will be discussed below. We also find modifications in the indicative, e.g. in *Bacch.* 887: *sī tibi est machaera, at nōbīs uerūinast domī*, 'if you have a sword, still, we have a spit at home.' Here the *sī*-clause is not a condition under which the main clause is true; whether Chrysalus has a spit or not does not depend on the soldier having a sword. The *at* actually shows that the *sī*-clause is not a condition proper.

<sup>48</sup> Some of them are in clauses that could be either pseudo-final and subordinate or main clause prohibitions.

unwanted consequences as intended, thus flouting the maxims of conversation. More examples can be found in Nisbet (1923).

## Other Subjunctival Clauses Modifying the Speech Act

Modification of the speech act is of course not restricted to pseudo-final clauses. Other types occur as well, for example thematic and restrictive *quod*-clauses; we find such types three times in Plautus and four times in Terence. It is only natural that they should not follow the sequence rules:<sup>49</sup>

(61) (Micio asks Aeschinus whether he has knocked at the door. Aeschinus denies it.)

*Micio*: Tūne hās pepulistī forēs? ...

Nīl mihi respondēs? *Aeschinus*: Nōn equidem istās, quod *sciam*.

(Ad. 638 + 641.)

*Micio*: Was it you who knocked at this door? ... Don't you reply anything to me? *Aeschinus*: Not this one, as far as I know.

Here Aeschinus' reply is elliptical, but from the preceding context it can easily be expanded to *nōn equidem istās pepulī, quod sciam*. The restrictive *quod*-clause, which is parenthetical,<sup>50</sup> modifies the speech act rather than the content of the speech.<sup>51</sup> That is why secondary sequence is impossible. The subjunctive is used to decrease the assertive force.<sup>52</sup>

## Other Clause Types

In the statistics on regular and irregular sequence in the next section I have not only excluded the above clause types, but also those

<sup>49</sup> K-St ii. 191 state that such clause types are linked to the speaker, not to the grammatical subject.

<sup>50</sup> Lebreton (1901: 224), in fact, analyses both *quod sciam* and pseudo-final clauses as parenthetical.

<sup>51</sup> Note that the pseudo-conditional *nīsī fallor*, 'unless I am mistaken', has a function similar to *quod sciam*.

<sup>52</sup> For the subjunctive of other verbs after *quod* in a slightly different meaning see *Asin.* 757–8: *quod... nōminēt aut quod... praedicēt*, 'if... she should call or if... she should allege.'

TABLE 3.5. Present and imperfect subjunctives in indirect questions and *quīn*-clauses

|         | Present subjunctives | Imperfect subjunctives |
|---------|----------------------|------------------------|
| Plautus | 72                   | 2                      |
| Terence | 35                   | 5                      |
| Total   | 107                  | 7                      |

dependent on forms of *cauēre* or *cautiō* and on extra-paradigmatic verb forms like *faxō*. The former will be treated under the prohibitions in Ch. 4, and the latter have not been considered because I do not want to prejudge the meaning of the irregular forms.

### SOME STATISTICS

I hope to have shown in the preceding sections that there are only two major differences in the sequence rules between Classical and Archaic Latin: on the one hand, Archaic Latin uses periphrastic subjunctives of the *-ūrus*-type more sparingly than Classical Latin, and on the other, backshift of tenses is not always compulsory if the verb of the governing clause is past.

Now that I have analysed my corpus in greater detail, I can revise my initial count in order to see how great the discrepancies between Archaic and Classical Latin really are in these respects. It is the clause types from the first section which matter. Those from the second are outside the scope of the sequence rules and cannot count, regardless of whether they seem to follow the sequence or not.

Table 3.5 displays the figures for indirect questions and *quīn*-clauses in the present and imperfect subjunctives in the three comedies which I examined.

Our three comedies contain 107 indirect questions and *quīn*-clauses in the present and seven in the imperfect subjunctive. It is difficult to say in how many of them there would be periphrastic *-ūrus*-subjunctives in Classical Latin. A large number of them simply refer to simultaneous events and could not possibly contain *-ūrus* forms. And among most of the others it is unclear whether there are modal nuances, such as deliberative ones, which are more easily

TABLE 3.6. Clauses with and without backshift in past contexts

|         | Backshift | No backshift |
|---------|-----------|--------------|
| Plautus | 44        | 2            |
| Terence | 27        | 1            |
| Total   | 71        | 3            |

expressed by the non-periphrastic subjunctives. Nevertheless the absence of *-ūrus*-subjunctives in indirect questions and *quīn*-clauses in my corpus seems to be significant: in the whole of Terence, there are only six periphrastic subjunctives, even though future reference is frequent in comedy; by contrast, in Cicero's *fin.*, a work which is not so future-oriented, there are seventeen, and in his *diu.*, which is much shorter, but more future-oriented, we find thirty-nine.

Table 3.6 contrasts clauses with and without expected backshift in past environments. It lists the cases where backshift applies and those where it does not apply, even though it should do so according to the classical rules. I have left aside those cases where there is no backshift, and where at the same time it would be optional in Classical Latin; consequently the nine present subjunctives after historic presents do not count here, but I have taken the three imperfect subjunctives into account. The twenty-two cases of primary sequence after perfects are not included because all these perfects can be interpreted as present perfects. Similarly, *uelis* in *Aul.* 686 (Ex. 40 above) was not taken into account because the perfect infinitive with which it goes is a 'present perfect infinitive'. All subjunctives after the *irreālis* with past reference have been considered because they are all backshifted. The *irreālis* with present reference is a special case; where it is a present subjunctive, it is present in both form and meaning and naturally only has primary sequence in our three plays, so it was not counted. Yet where it is an imperfect subjunctive, it is only semantically present, but morphologically past, and so there is backshift in Classical Latin. I have expected verbs dependent on such unreal subjunctives to exhibit backshift, and have counted the relevant forms under 'backshift' and 'no backshift'.

The table shows that exceptions to the backshift rules are equally frequent in Plautus and Terence, or rather equally rare: there are

TABLE 3.7. Clauses with regular and with irregular sequence

|         | Regular sequence | Irregular sequence |
|---------|------------------|--------------------|
| Plautus | 336              | 2                  |
| Terence | 165              | 1                  |
| Total   | 501              | 3                  |

only three tokens in three comedies which do not have the expected backshift (*Aul.* 550, 743, and *Ad.* 317), while there are seventy-one that conform to the standard rules. On the whole, therefore, the classical rules work well for Archaic Latin. This becomes even more obvious if we look at the subordinate clauses expected to follow the sequence rules as a whole (Table 3.7).

This table too shows that the exceptions are as rare in Plautus as they are in Terence. The total of exceptions is less than 1%. Such a degree of regularity must come as a surprise to anyone who has read the lists of exceptions in the standard manuals, but not set them in relation to the whole of the corpus.

## CONCLUSIONS

At the beginning of this chapter I asked three questions concerning the sequence of tenses in Archaic Latin. In order to answer them, I first collected all subordinate clauses in the subjunctive in a corpus consisting of three comedies, *Aul.*, *Curc.*, and *Ad.*

First, I described the classical sequence rules in some detail and illustrated them with examples from Classical Latin and the three plays. By doing so I showed that the expression of posteriority is not yet frequent in Archaic Latin subordinate clauses and that it is usually the context that shows whether a subjunctive has to be interpreted as simultaneous or posterior. Apart from that, the norms of usage turned out to be very similar in Archaic and Classical Latin, and so the classical rules can on the whole be applied equally well to Plautus and Terence.

Not even in Classical Latin is it the case that all subordinate clauses are subject to the sequence rules. In the second section, I therefore separated those clauses in the three comedies that would for semantic reasons not necessarily follow the rules in Classical Latin. The fact that such clauses do not have to obey the *cōnsecūtiō* in Classical Latin does of course not mean that they could not do so in Archaic Latin, but an examination of the data shows that these exceptions to the sequence are shared by Classical and Archaic Latin. The clauses in question are those which have independent modal meaning (mostly *irreālis*) conveyed by a special combination of tense and subjunctive, those which can be referred to the moment of speech rather than another reference point (*ut cōnsecūtūum*), and finally those which modify the speech act rather than the content of the speech (pseudo-final clauses etc.).

After this analysis, I was in a position to count the exceptions to the classical rules in my corpus. There is only one periphrastic *-ūrus*-form (in an *ut*-clause). It is impossible to say how many there would be if this were Classical Latin, but the almost complete absence is significant. Apart from that, there are merely three tokens in the three plays which are not in agreement with the classical rules; none of them exhibits the expected backshift. An examination of the grammars by Lindsay (1907: 56–7), Allardice (1929: 70–2), and Bennett (1910: 338–47) suggests that backshift is not yet compulsory in Archaic Latin; but my own statistics demonstrate that the laws of sequence are not as often defied as Lindsay (1907: 56) might make us believe: the total of exceptions is less than 1%, and lack of backshift occurs in around 4% of the cases where backshift is expected.<sup>53</sup> The exceptions could perhaps be regarded as instances in which the lack of backshift is intended to convey greater immediacy.<sup>54</sup>

<sup>53</sup> There are 74 tokens which are expected to be backshifted. Three of them are not, which amounts to 4.05%.

<sup>54</sup> This is what Allardice (1929: 71) means by ‘vivid Present Subj.’. Wirtzfeld (1888: 27–8) has two different explanations for lack of backshift: he regards the perfect instead of the pluperfect as a colloquialism, and the present for the imperfect as due to metrical necessities. However, no writer would choose an ungrammatical construction simply to satisfy metrical constraints. Since both exceptions can be brought under the same heading ‘lack of backshift’, a unified account seems preferable to me.

Sequence of tenses is naturally only important for subordinate clauses. A relatively large number of extra-paradigmatic subjunctives (Chs. 7, 9, and 10) occur in such subordinate clauses. Many of them, however, are also found in main clauses. Here it is especially the forms in prohibitions that pose a number of problems. Again, it is easier to understand the meaning of the extra-paradigmatic forms in such contexts once we know how the regular forms are employed here. Prohibitions containing regular subjunctive forms are therefore the topic of the next chapter.

## Prohibitions with *fēcerīs* and *faciās* in Archaic Latin

MANY of the extra-paradigmatic subjunctives occur in prohibitions. They are of course not the only forms used in prohibitive clauses; here they alternate with a whole range of other forms. The extra-paradigmatic subjunctives and their functions in prohibitive clauses cannot be understood in a vacuum. Rather, the usage of such forms has to be compared with that of the regular ones. But which forms can be contrasted with which? The answer is not straightforward. The various alternations between regular forms in prohibitive clauses have often been discussed in the literature, but the differences between these constructions and the rationale behind them have not been worked out clearly. However, these distinctions are essential if the irregular forms are to be compared with the regular ones. In this chapter, I shall therefore discuss prohibitions containing regular forms in Archaic Latin. What is more, I shall concentrate on prohibitions containing subjunctives. This restriction is sensible because extra-paradigmatic subjunctives can of course more easily be compared with other subjunctives than with imperatives or indicatives. The only regular subjunctives in prohibitions are the perfect and present forms, for example *fēcerīs* and *faciās*. The prohibitions containing the extra-paradigmatic subjunctives themselves will be dealt with extensively in Chs. 7, 9, and 10.

It might be helpful to begin the discussion by setting up a general typology of prohibitive clauses. The prohibitions with extra-paradigmatic forms can be introduced by volitive *nē* (*nē duīs*, 'don't give', in *Capt.* 331), by other, more neutral negatives such as

*nec*<sup>1</sup> (*neque te occultāssīs*, ‘and don’t conceal yourself’, in *Trin.* 627), or by *cauē* (*cauē fuās*, ‘don’t be’, in *Persa* 51). In prohibitions with *nē*, *nec*, and *cauē* there are also perfect subjunctives like *fēcerīs* or present subjunctives like *faciās*. In clauses with *nē* or *nec*, imperatives can be seen as well, for instance *fac* or *facitō*; however, I shall not discuss them in detail because there are no extra-paradigmatic imperatives in my text sample. Even indicatives appear in prohibitions, for example *faciēs*; these, however, can only be introduced by the factual *nōn*, but not by the volitive *nē*, which is why I shall not examine them.<sup>2</sup>

Thus all three Latin moods, indicative, subjunctive, and imperative, can occur in directives, that is in commands and prohibitions. If one disregards expressions involving gerunds and gerundives, the only indicative tense that can be used in this way in Archaic Latin is the future.<sup>3</sup> Since it is negated by the factual *nōn*, it is clear that formally such sentences are statements; they are merely interpreted as commands or prohibitions in suitable contexts. The directive subjunctives and the imperatives, on the other hand, take the volitive *nē* or neutral negatives like *nūllus*, but never *nōn*. The alleged instances of *nōn* with prohibitive subjunctives are best taken as cases of—frequently contrastive—constituent negation, see Pinkster (1986: 149–50).<sup>4</sup>

If the indicatives and the subjunctival exhortations addressed to the first person<sup>5</sup> are left aside, three formal criteria can be used to distinguish between the various expressions:

<sup>1</sup> *Nec* is actually more frequent in prohibitions than *nēue*, see Bennett (1910: 168).

<sup>2</sup> *Haud* can of course be used as well, as in *Pseud.* 654 (*hūc quidem hercle haud ībis intrō*). We also find other negatives that are neutral with regard to the distinction between volitive and factual, e.g. *neque*.

<sup>3</sup> See Risselada (1993: 165–6). In later Latin, the present indicative occurs as well; for clear examples from Palladius see Adams (1995a: 466).

<sup>4</sup> I am referring here to the type *nōn x* (*sc. sed y*) *faciās*, which I regard not as a prohibition, but as a command; *nōn* only negates the constituent *x*, so we should translate ‘you should do *y*, not *x*’. *Nē* occurs here as well: *ita fugiās nē praeter casam* (*Phorm.* 768) should be interpreted as ‘so you are to flee, but not beyond the hut’, see Sargeaunt (1914: 91).

<sup>5</sup> Such exhortations are different from other directives in that the speaker is also intended as subject.

1. Is the directive simple or periphrastic? The simple directives, for example *nē fēcerīs*, do not involve subordination. Periphrastic expressions, on the other hand, contain a matrix verb like *cūrā* or *nōlī*, sometimes a subordinator, and a verb in the subjunctive or the infinitive with the same subject as the matrix verb, for instance *cūrā ut ualeās* ('make sure that you're well') or *nōlīte clāmāre* ('do not shout'). Consequently *dīcās uelim* ('I wish you said', *Cas.* 234) and *fac uacent aedēs* ('make sure the house is empty', *Cas.* 521) cannot count as periphrastic commands proper.
2. Is there a negative? In other words, are the tokens commands or prohibitions? In what follows, I use 'command' as a technical term for all positive directives, and 'prohibition' for all negative ones. Not all commands and prohibitions here are commands and prohibitions in the everyday sense of the word.
3. Is the directive intended for the second person or the third (the distinction between sg. and pl. is irrelevant here)?

If we restrict ourselves to the regular forms for the moment, we arrive at the following subtypes:

1. simple commands:

second person: *amā* (present imperative), *amātō* (future imperative), *amēs* (present subjunctive);

third person: *amātō* (future imperative<sup>6</sup>), *amet* (present subjunctive);

2. simple prohibitions:

second person: *nē amā* (present imperative), *nē amāuerīs* (perfect subjunctive<sup>7</sup>), *nē amēs* (present subjunctive);

third person: *nē amātō* (future imperative), *nē amet* (present subjunctive);

<sup>6</sup> In the pl., the 2nd and 3rd pers. are distinct. Note that the future imperative may be deponent, but never passive; *appellāminō* 'they shall be called' in *Cic. leg.* 3. 8 is a false archaism.

<sup>7</sup> Regular perfect subjunctives like *amāuerīs* are not used in commands, *pace* Bennett (1910: 166). He has four examples, none of which is convincing: *prohibēsseis* in *Enn. scaen.* 239 is sigmatic and thus outside the regular system (for remarks on the passage as a whole see Jocelyn 1967: 369–75); *āmiserīs* in *Trin.* 1054 should be regarded as potential; and I take *inuēneris* (*Bacch.* 840) and *uiderit* (*Ad.* 437) as future perfects.

## 3. periphrastic commands:

second person: *cūrā ut* + subjunctive, *fac (ut)* + subjunctive (cf. *face ut impetrēs*, ‘make sure you achieve’, in *Cas.* 714 and *facito ut faciās*, ‘make sure you make’, in *Bacch.* 1153), etc.;

third person: *uideant ut* + subjunctive (cf. *tempora monent ut uideat ut satis faciat quibus dēbeat*, ‘the situation demands that he should satisfy those to whom he owes’, in *Cic. Att.* 11. 16. 5), etc.;

## 4. periphrastic prohibitions:

second person: *cauē*<sup>8</sup> + present or perfect subjunctive, *nōlī* + infinitive,<sup>9</sup> etc.;

third person: *dēsinat* + infinitive (cf. *amāre dēsināt*, ‘let him stop loving’, in *Pseud.* 307), etc.

Among the simple types (1 and 2), there are formal parallels between commands and prohibitions: there are three second-person and two third-person forms each. However, it is only in prohibitions (2 and 4) that the perfect subjunctive can be employed. Synchronically speaking, this usage is peculiar. In Ch. 3 we saw that in subordinate clauses perfect subjunctives express anteriority to other, non-past events. All attempts to establish a semantic connection between the prohibitive function of this tense and its more frequent uses denoting anteriority are artificial and bound to fail. Schütz (1929: 174–6), for example, argues that negation is emphatic. He claims that, since the *perfectum* is ‘concluded’ (*abgeschlossen*) and has a ‘past element’ (*Vergangenheitselement*), it is also emphatic; hence its use in prohibitions.

<sup>8</sup> The scansion is normally *căuē*, but *căuē* in *Pseud.* 1296–7. In *Cic. fin.* 2. 84 it is claimed that *cauneās* ‘figs from Caunus’ could be interpreted as *cauē nē eās*. This has sometimes been taken as an indication that some people said *cau*, but I do not think that it is conclusive evidence since a divine warning does not require the two utterances to be absolutely identical. In metrical texts there are no instances of the imperative sg. that have to be interpreted as monosyllabic, and the form always scans as disyllabic at line end. Drexler (1969) argues convincingly that iambic shortening is a *sandhi*-phenomenon occurring if other words follow. Thus we ought to scan *căuē* at line end.

<sup>9</sup> According to Lebreton (1901: 305), this type of prohibition is polite. By contrast, Pinkster (1986: 154) thinks that there is only a slight preference for *nōlī* in polite contexts.

However, many commands are just as emphatic as prohibitions, but still the perfect subjunctive is excluded from them. Moreover, the supposed past element does not trigger backshift of tenses in subordinate clauses dependent on prohibitions, see Ex. 7 in Ch. 3. Finally, if there were anteriority in *nē fēcerīs*, what would this mean? And why would *nē fēcerīs* be turned into *nē faciās* (present) in indirect speech dependent on *dīcō*?<sup>10</sup>

Vairel's solution (1978a) is more ingenious, but equally untenable. She tries to connect the potential *dīxerit quis*, 'someone might say', with the prohibitive *nē fēcerīs*, 'don't do'. She thinks that, compared with *dīcat quis*, *dīxerit quis* is a milder form of expression, while *nē fēcerīs* is more forceful than *nē faciās* (1978a: 309). The *perfectum* can signify *moindre actualisation* (1978a: 319). In the case of a potential clause this feature results in a weakened statement, while in the case of a prohibition it leads to a strengthening of the prohibitive value, as if we were saying 'under no circumstances'. Vairel's premises are far from certain: it is not clear whether *dīxerim* really is milder than *dīcam* (see Pinkster 1986: 151), and we shall find that prohibitions in the perfect subjunctive are not more peremptory than those in the present. Consequently Vairel's theory cannot be upheld.

From a synchronic point of view, *nē fēcerīs* does not fit into the regular tense system. Therefore Pinkster (1986: 155) is probably right in regarding the construction as an idiomatic exception. The prohibitive perfect subjunctive is virtually restricted to the second person singular and plural, which confirms its idiomatic status. It is not clear whether the few examples in the third person are archaisms or short-lived innovations based on the second person. Bennett (1910: 171) cites two examples from Archaic Latin. One of them, however, is a sigmatic form in a final clause (*faxīt* in *Phorm.* 554). The other is from Cato *agr.* 5. 3 (*dederīt nēmīnī*, 'he shall not give to anyone'). I may add *caue... fēcerīt*, 'let him not do', (*Men.* 994) and *ēminōr interminōrque*:

<sup>10</sup> On the type *neiquis... habuisse uelēt* see Daube (1956: 37–49), who argues that such infinitives mark anteriority ('let no one wish to have had'). Indeed, from a synchronic point of view, the rationale behind *nē habuerīs* and *neiquis... habuisse uelēt* need not be the same if the latter really indicates anteriority.

*nē mi opstiterīt obuīam*, 'I give a strict warning: let no one stand in my way' (*Capt.* 791; I do not regard this as a subordinate clause because the perfect subjunctive always has past meaning there).<sup>11</sup> Wackernagel's diachronic explanation of the prohibitive use of this tense seems to be correct (1926: 250): originally, the Latin perfect subjunctive was a non-past form, like the Greek aorist subjunctive and optative. The perfect indicative, on the other hand, was a past tense. It is the connection with the perfect indicative which led to the regular past force of the subjunctives. Apart from the prohibitions, this non-past meaning survives only with verbs like *dīcere* in phrases such as *dīxerit quispiam*.<sup>12</sup>

The periphrastic directives (3 and 4) form an open system, unlike the simple ones, which are restricted to the types listed above. The reason is that the periphrastic expressions are, for the most part, lexical rather than grammatical, often with complex semantics.<sup>13</sup> However, some of them have become simple, grammatical directives in Archaic Latin and are still used in this way in the classical language, for example *nōlī*:

(1) (Cicero is asking the judges to spare Caelius for the sake of his old father.)  
*Nōlīte, iūdicēs, ... hunc iam nātūrā ipsā occidentem uelle mātūrius exstinguī uolnere uestro quam suō fātō.* (Cic. *Cael.* 79.)

Judges, *do not resolve* that this man, already passing away through nature herself, should come to an end more quickly through your wounding him rather than through his own fate.

<sup>11</sup> Other Italic languages cannot help us to find out what the situation was in Proto-Italic (3rd pers. aorist subjunctive or future imperative?) because even Oscan and Umbrian differ from each other in this respect. In Oscan 3rd-pers. prohibitions, the perfect subjunctive is used, while Umbrian has the future imperative; when Umbrian does employ the subjunctive, it is not the perfect (for examples see von Planta 1897: 433–4).

<sup>12</sup> After the archaic period, the type *dīxerit quispiam* spreads to subordinate clauses, cf. *ut ita dīxerim*, 'so to speak', in Tac. *Agr.* 3.

<sup>13</sup> In a simple directive like *nē fēceris*, *nē* can alternate with other grammatical items such as *nihil* or *nūllus*; such alternatives differ in intensity, but not in content. In a periphrastic directive like *dēsine male loquī*, 'stop insulting', *dēsine* can be replaced by another content word such as *mitte*; there may be a difference in intensity, but there is also a distinction in content.

Here *nōlīte* must have lost its original meaning ‘do not resolve’, otherwise it could not be combined with *uēlle* ‘want, resolve’. ‘Do not intend to intend’ would be grotesque. *Nōlīte* has become an inflected prohibition marker. I shall argue below that the form *cauē* is undergoing a similar grammaticalization process.

I need not concern myself with all these types of directives here. I am mainly interested in those that can be compared with the more frequent types with morphologically irregular forms. Thus my main focus will be the simple prohibitions that contain subjunctives (under 2), and the periphrastic prohibitions with *cauē* (under 4). Within these limits, however, I shall examine all the tokens in Plautus and Terence. The other constructions are only relevant here insofar as they shed light on these two types.

It turns out that each of the prohibitive subtypes I shall be looking at can, in the second person, have either the present or the perfect subjunctive. In this chapter, it is my aim to find out whether there are semantic or other differences corresponding to this formal distinction, and if so, what they are.

If two prohibitions differ semantically, they can do so in several respects. The contrasts which are perhaps most frequently claimed to exist in Latin prohibitions and which I shall discuss in some detail concern the following three features:<sup>14</sup>

1. register;<sup>15</sup>
2. politeness;<sup>16</sup>
3. time sphere, for example near versus distant or contingent future, and inhibitive versus preventive prohibitions.

The prohibitive subtypes differ with regard to their negative particles: I shall first deal with prohibitions introduced by *nē* or *nēue*, *minimē*, *nēmō*, *neque* or *nec*, *nihil*, and *nūllus*. After that, I shall examine the various constructions which the forms of *cauēre* can have.

<sup>14</sup> Somewhat different criteria can be found in Risselada (1993: 6–10).

<sup>15</sup> See the introductory chapter for a general discussion of register.

<sup>16</sup> See Brown and Levinson (1987) for a survey of politeness phenomena in unrelated languages; valuable criticisms can be found in Watts (2003). As I shall point out in more detail in what follows, sociolinguistic criteria are not always applicable to a literary genre like comedy.

PROHIBITIONS WITH *NĒ* (*NĒVE*), *MINIMĒ*, *NĒMŌ*,  
*NEQVE* (*NEC*), *NIHIL*, AND *NŪLLVS*

I distinguish between those prohibitions that are introduced by *nē* and *nēue* on the one hand, and those that have *minimē*, *nēmō*, *neque* (*nec*), *nihil*, and *nūllus* on the other. The reasons for this are practical, not semantic: many of the former clauses, but hardly any of the latter, can be ambiguous between main and subordinate clauses. This is because the negatives *minimē*, *neque/nec*, *nēmō*, *nihil*, and *nūllus* cannot normally function as subordinators. (The exception is *neque/nec*, which may continue *ut*- and *nē*-clauses; see H-S 536.) Since these items, unlike *nē/nēue*, are neutral with regard to volition, they can negate indicatives as well.

I shall first look at some problems of disambiguation concerning *nē/nēue*, but after that I shall not distinguish between *nē/nēue* and the other negative particles any more. Next, I shall turn to statistics, and then to the various factors that could help to find a semantic distinction between perfect and present subjunctive.

### Problems in the Classification of *nē*-Clauses

Diachronically, subordinate *nē*-clauses are probably derived from independent prohibitions or wishes, see H-S 533. This process must to a large extent have taken place in prehistoric times. However, when looking at the secondary literature, one cannot help getting the impression that some scholars, while in theory acknowledging the antiquity of these changes, do not do so in practice. Thus Vallejo (1942: 297–8) thinks that he can find 98 examples of the prohibitive type *nē faciās* in Plautus, a figure which seems to be too high. Some of these clauses must be subordinate. Lebreton (1901: 301–5) falls into the opposite extreme when it comes to Ciceronian data; he claims that the prohibitive type *nē faciās* is not used by Cicero at all and regards the relevant tokens as dependent clauses. As prohibitives can only be discussed if there is a reliable collection of the data, I have compiled one myself. I shall now explain why it is often difficult to distinguish prohibitions from subordinate clauses.

Virtually all *nē*-clauses with second or third person present or perfect subjunctives could, out of context, be prohibitions. Consequently they are all relevant. The exceptions are clauses introduced by *ut nē* (e.g. *Ad.* 354) or *dum nē*, where the complex subordinator makes a prohibitive interpretation impossible.

*Nē*-clauses can be not only prohibitions or wishes, but also subject, object, final, or pseudo-final clauses. Ex. 2 is an unambiguous prohibition, but Ex. 3 could be either a prohibition or a final *nē*-clause, and Ex. 4 could be either a prohibition or a pseudo-final clause:

(2) (Philito and his son Lysiteles are talking about a poor young man.)

*Philito*: Agedum ēloquere, quid dare illī nunc uīs? *Lysiteles*: Nihil quicquam, pater.

*Tū modo nē mē prohibeās accipere sī quid dēt mihi.* (*Trin.* 369–70.)

*Philito*: But come on, speak out. What do you wish to give him now? *Lysiteles*: Nothing at all, father; only *don't* you *prevent* my accepting, if he gives me something. (transl. Nixon 1938: v. 133)

(3) (Parmeno is afraid that Thais' servant Pythias might harm his master's son. He tells her who the young man is, implying that it would be dangerous to mistreat someone in his position.)

*Parmeno*: Dico ēdicō uōbīs nostrum esse illum erilem filium. *Pythias*: Hem, opsecro, an is est? *Parmeno*: *Nē* quam in illum Thāis uim fierī *sināt*.

(*Eun.* 962–3.)

(a) *Parmeno*: I hereby declare to you that he is our young master. *Pythias*: Oh, really, is he? *Parmeno*: Thais *must not allow* that anything bad happens to him!

(b) *Parmeno*: I hereby declare to you that he is our young master ... *Pythias*: Oh, really, is he? *Parmeno*: ... *in order that* Thais *does not allow* that anything bad happens to him.

(4) (Sosia is feeling sick.)

*Vix incēdo inānis, ne ire posse cum onere existumēs.* (*Amph.* 330.)

(a) I can barely walk empty-handed; *don't think* that I can go with a burden.

(b) *Lest* you *should think* that I can go with a burden: I can barely walk empty-handed.

In Ex. 2 there is nothing the *nē*-clause could depend on, so it must be a main clause prohibition. In Ex. 3, the *nē*-clause could also be a

prohibition, compare translation (a).<sup>17</sup> Alternatively, we could argue that Parmeno is interrupted by Pythias and that he then continues his sentence. If so, the *nē*-clause gives us the reason for Parmeno's *dīco ēdīcō*: 'I hereby declare *x* to you, in order that Thais does not allow *y*.' It is almost certain that the two interpretations could be distinguished by their intonations, but this cannot help us any more today, and it will not have helped a Roman reader. Similarly, the *nē*-clause in Ex. 4 is ambiguous between a prohibition (translation *a*) and a pseudo-final clause (translation *b*).<sup>18</sup> Pascucci's stance (1961: 128), on the other hand, is similar to that of Vallejo (1942) above. He treats the *nē*-clause as an independent prohibition, not as a (pseudo-)final clause.<sup>19</sup> He thinks that a final interpretation would only be possible if a governing phrase like *hoc tē ammoneō* were inserted. However, it was already recognized by Ammann (1927: 338) that subordinate *nē*-clauses need not be true purpose clauses, but can inform us about the purpose of saying something, which might be the case here. Pinkster (1990: 34–5) calls such clauses 'pseudo-purpose satellites'.<sup>20</sup> If we want to be on the safe side, instances like Exx. 3 and 4 must be classified as ambiguous.

There are several criteria that may help us to distinguish between prohibitions and subordinate *nē*-clauses:

1. Prohibitions can stand on their own. Subordinate clauses, on the other hand, can only do so if a main clause can readily be understood from the context.

<sup>17</sup> This is Kauer and Lindsay's interpretation; they punctuate *nē quam... sināt!*

<sup>18</sup> Examples of clauses that are ambiguous between main and subordinate clauses can be found in Pfister (1995).

<sup>19</sup> Somewhat surprisingly, Pascucci sees as prohibitive some examples that I cannot take that way, e.g. Cic. *Cluent.* 95: *nec P. Popilius neque Q. Metellus clārissimī uirī atque amplissimī uim tribūniciam sustinere potuerunt, nēdum... sine uestrā sapientiā ac sine iūdiciorū remediīs salū esse possimus*. The correct translation must be 'neither P. Popilius nor Q. Metellus, most celebrated and distinguished men, were able to keep the tribunes' force in check, let alone... that we should be able to be safe without your wisdom and without the remedies of the legal proceedings.' Prohibitive 'let us not be able to be safe' cannot be what is meant.

<sup>20</sup> See Ch. 3. Bennett (1910: 168) states that most instances of *nē errēs*, *nē censeās*, and *nē frūstrā sīs* are 'dependent purpose clauses', by which he presumably means pseudo-final clauses. But then he cites some as prohibitions. He does not explain how he distinguishes between the two or classifies doubtful cases.

2. Prohibitions cannot be introduced by *ut nē*, but subordinate clauses can have *ut nē* as well as *nē*.
3. Prohibitions can only be in the present or perfect subjunctive, while subordinate clauses are not restricted in this way.
4. The perfect subjunctive in prohibitions has non-past meaning, whereas the perfect in subordinate clauses is past or anterior.

In practice, these criteria are not always helpful. As long as a clause can be seen in more than one way, I shall not draw on it in my discussion or in my figures in this chapter. Although I shall probably not be able to be completely objective either, I shall certainly be more so than if I did not acknowledge any ambiguities and opted for the interpretation that seemed more probable to me. Plautus and Terence may have intended some of the ambiguous cases as prohibitions, but one cannot know this for certain. I have come to the conclusion that among the Plautine and Terentian *nē*-clauses with second and third person present subjunctives, 105 are ambiguous between pseudo-final clauses and prohibitions, while only 43 are clearly prohibitive. Of the clearly prohibitive tokens, twenty-five are in the third person, one is an impersonal second person, and seventeen are definite second persons.

There is a second problem. How can we differentiate between prohibitions and wishes? One might wonder whether it actually makes sense to draw such a distinction in Latin. In Greek, prohibitions are often in the aorist subjunctive,<sup>21</sup> while wishes can be in the aorist optative:

- (5) (Clytemnestra is about to be murdered.)

ὦ τέκνα, πρὸς θεῶν, μὴ κτάνητε μητέρα. (Euripides, *Electra* 1165.)

O children, by the gods, *don't kill* your mother!

- (6) (Admetus urges Heracles to stay.)

*Heracles*: ξένων πρὸς ἄλλων ἐστίαν πορεύσομαι.

*Admetus*: οὐκ ἔστιν, ὦναξ. μὴ τοσόνδ' ἔλθοι καχόν.

(Euripides, *Alcestis* 538–9.)

*Heracles*: I shall go to the hearth of other friends. *Admetus*: Impossible, my lord. *May* such a great evil *not come*.

<sup>21</sup> The present imperative is also possible, albeit with a different meaning.

Ex. 5 is a prohibition, Ex. 6 is a negated wish. In both cases, the negative is the deontic  $\mu\acute{\eta}$ . However, there is a difference of mood: the subjunctive is used for the prohibition, the optative for the wish.

Latin, on the other hand, does not have this formal distinction between subjunctive and optative, and *nē faciat* can be either a prohibition or a wish. Still, I should like to differentiate between (positive and negative) directives and wishes for four reasons:<sup>22</sup>

1. While some particles like *ut* can introduce either directives or wishes, others, for instance *utinam*, are restricted to the latter.<sup>23</sup>
2. Directives presuppose that the thing ordered or prohibited can be carried out or abstained from, which is not necessarily the case for wishes; thus verbs like ‘sleep’ may occur in wishes, but not in directives.<sup>24</sup>
3. Only in wishes, but not in prohibitions, can the imperfect or pluperfect subjunctive be used; it then shows that the wish cannot be fulfilled.
4. Directives always have non-past reference, even in prohibitions containing the perfect subjunctive; in wishes, on the other hand, the perfect has past reference.<sup>25</sup>

In Plautus and Terence there are two negated wishes in the present and four in the perfect; they are in the second or the third person. There are no regular forms that are ambiguous between wishes and prohibitions. However, in later chapters we shall encounter extra-paradigmatic subjunctives that could be either.

<sup>22</sup> Contrary to what might be expected, there are no restrictions concerning person for either of these two categories. There are not only wishes for the 1st pers. sg. (e.g. *utinam conueniam*, ‘may I meet’, in *Epid.* 196), but also exhortations (e.g. *taceam nunciam*, ‘let me be silent’, in *Bacch.* 1058; see K–St i. 180).

<sup>23</sup> *Velim* is also becoming a particle introducing wishes; see Morris (1897: 285).

<sup>24</sup> Imperatives are prototypically used in directives. Yet if the speech act makes reference to things that are beyond control, the sentence with the imperative will be interpreted as a wish, as in *Rud.* 582: *tū uel sūdā uel peri algū uel tu aegrōtā uel ualē*, ‘sweat or perish through cold, or be ill or be well.’

<sup>25</sup> Cf. *Poen.* 799, where the advocates say *apscessit*, ‘he left’, and Agorastocles replies *utinam hinc abierit malam crucem*, ‘may he have gone from here to be hanged.’ Because of the preceding perfect indicative, the wish in the perfect subjunctive must have past reference. Negated wishes in the perfect subjunctive with past meaning can be found in *Ad.* 36–8.

TABLE 4.1. The present subjunctive versus the present imperative and the perfect subjunctive

|                               | 1st pers.<br>(mainly pl.) | 2nd pers. (sg./pl.)            | 3rd pers. (sg./pl.)                   |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Positive, present subjunctive | <i>faciāmus</i>           | <i>faciās/faciātis</i>         | <i>faciat/faciant</i>                 |
| Negative, present subjunctive | <i>nē faciāmus</i>        | <i>nē faciās/nē faciātis</i>   | <i>nē faciat/nē faciant</i>           |
| Positive, present imperative  | —                         | <i>fac/facite</i>              | —                                     |
| Negative, perfect subjunctive | —                         | <i>nē fēceris/nē fēceritis</i> | <i>(nē fēcerit/nē fēcerint, rare)</i> |

## Second and Third Persons: Some Data

Most scholars try to examine the difference between the types *nē fēceris* and *nē faciās* in isolation. However, these types are part of a larger paradigm. Consequently we are bound to neglect some differences if we look only at second-person prohibitions. To begin with, the perfect subjunctive in directives is more restricted than its present tense counterpart with regard not only to person, but also to negation. This can be seen from Table 4.1.

The table contains only those simple directives that have no special temporal or aspectual features. Since *facitō* (2nd and 3rd pers.) and *nē facitō* (3rd pers.) refer to the distant future, they have not been considered. Similarly, *nē fac* was left aside because it is inhibitive, that is, it means ‘stop doing’.<sup>26</sup> What remains is the positive and negative present subjunctives, the positive present imperative, and the negated perfect subjunctive. We can now see that the imperative and the perfect subjunctive are similar in that they are restricted to the prototypical directives: they are usually employed for definite second persons, that is to say for direct addresses. The present subjunctive can be used more freely. It is found with definite as well as indefinite<sup>27</sup> second persons, and it can in addition occur in the first and third persons. I leave out the first-person plural directives because

<sup>26</sup> See the introductory section of this chapter.

<sup>27</sup> An example for the indefinite 2nd pers. in English is *you can take a horse to water, but you can't make him drink*. Here ‘you’ could be replaced by the impersonal ‘one’, although the latter is much more formal. For the 2nd pers. in Latin see Ex. 14 below. Sometimes the imperative or the negated perfect subjunctive is also employed when we should expect reference to an impersonal 2nd pers.

TABLE 4.2. Prohibitions with negatives other than *cauē*

|                      | 2nd pers. | 3rd pers. |
|----------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Present subjunctives | 20        | 40        |
| Perfect subjunctives | 27        | 1         |

Note: I have included all negatives other than *cauē*, not just *nē* and *nēue*. The one impersonal 2nd pers. present subjunctive has also been counted.

they involve engagement of the speaker as well as of the addressee, unless there is a *plūrālis maiestātis*, in which case only the speaker has to act. Not only *faciās*, but also *faciat*, is opposed to *fac*. Similarly, not only *nē faciās*, but also *nē faciat*, stands in contrast to *nē fēcerīs*.

If, like several scholars, I were merely looking for an aspectual distinction between *nē fēcerīs* (2nd pers., *perfectum*) and *nē faciās* (2nd pers., *infectum*), I should have to ask myself two questions: first, why is there no such contrast in the third person? Here *nē faciat* is normal, while *nē fēcerit* is very rare. And second, why is there no such contrast among the commands? *Fac* and *facitō* both belong to the *infectum*. Prohibitions are of course not simply negated commands. Still, if an aspectual (not temporal) distinction between perfective and imperfective was preserved in the prohibitions, why not in the commands as well? Greek does have a distinction between aorist (perfective) and present (imperfective) imperative.

Let us now look at the distribution of persons and tenses. In Table 4.2, I have collected all the data from Plautus and Terence. As will be seen, the present is not rare in the second or the third person, but in the third person it is twice as frequent. By contrast, the perfect is common for second-person prohibitions, but hardly ever used for the third person. This pattern of distribution must be significant.<sup>28</sup> I shall attempt to explain it diachronically later on, but before that I shall examine whether there are differences of register, politeness, or time sphere between the second-person prohibitions *nē fēcerīs* and *nē faciās*.

<sup>28</sup> In fact, the likelihood that it is statistically significant is above 99.95%, as a t-test shows.

### Register

In Plautus and Terence, the types *nē faciās* and *nē fēceris* are relatively frequent. According to Pinkster (1986: 153), the former occurs only three times in Cicero, while the latter has forty-three tokens.<sup>29</sup> This pattern of distribution could be explained in various ways. Vairel (1981: 255–6) argues that the reason behind the rarity of *nē faciās* in Cicero is that it is colloquial. At the same time, however, she claims that *nē faciat* (3rd pers.) is stylistically unmarked because it is not opposed to a perfect subjunctive and thus the only way of expressing a third-person prohibition (1981: 259–60).

Is the type *nē faciās* colloquial in Archaic Latin? Forms and phrases that are unmarked for register should have a distribution of 3 : 1 over Plautine cantica and senarii, while high-register forms should be more frequent in cantica.<sup>30</sup> In all Plautus, the type *nē fēceris* occurs seventeen times in cantica and six times in senarii, which is the normal, unmarked pattern of distribution. It turns out that the type *nē faciās* is distributed in the same way: there are nine tokens in Plautine cantica and three in the senarii. But since these figures are low, one should not attach too much weight to them.

What is more important is the fact that the prohibitive present subjunctive is compatible not only with neutral contexts, but also with relatively formal ones. *Nē mē prohibeās*, ‘do not hinder me’, in *Trin.* 370, for instance, is embedded in quite a stiff exchange between a father and a son. The father keeps moralizing, while the son keeps stressing his obedience. *Ne imbītās*, ‘don’t go in’, in *Epid.* 145 is in a threat, and threats are often phrased in legalistic language. In *Most.* 886a a slave says *mihi molestus nē siēs*, ‘don’t annoy me’, and his colleague replies *uide ut fastīdit sīmia* in l. 887, ‘look how the ape is giving himself airs’; this remark is of course directed against the first slave’s behaviour as a whole, but it also seems to indicate that he is not using neutral language. In *Curc.* 539, the soldier Therapon-tigonus uses two present subjunctives, *nē... faciās... aut... cēseās*, ‘don’t... do... or... think’; throughout the whole scene, he employs

<sup>29</sup> Lebreton (1901: 300) also says that there are forty-three prohibitive perfect subjunctives in Cicero, but K–St i. 189 n. 1 add three more. However, the general picture remains, whether we take our figures from Pinkster or K–St.

<sup>30</sup> See the introductory chapter for a more detailed discussion.

the pompous language typical of *mīlitēs glōriōsī*, as shown by Monaco (1969: 202): there is the litotes *nōn...mediocrī* ‘not...with common’ (l. 533), the etymological figure *īrātus īrācundiā* ‘enraged with rage’ (l. 533), the grandiose phrase *excidiōnem facere...oppidīs* ‘bring destruction...to cities’ (l. 534), and the etymological figure followed by alliteration *properē properās...properā pōnere* ‘you hurry hurriedly...hurry to put down’ (l. 535–6).

On the whole, then, it seems unlikely that *nē faciās* in itself is any more colloquial than *nē fēceris*.<sup>31</sup>

### Politeness

Directives can differ in their degree of politeness. In general, it is mainly two criteria that determine what level of politeness is appropriate: first, who benefits from the execution of the directive? And second, what relationship obtains between speaker and addressee?<sup>32</sup>

Concerning the first point, the most basic distinction that can be drawn is that between directives in which the speaker benefits from the execution and those in which the addressee gains some advantage. *Pass the salt, please* belongs to the first type because if the speaker gets the salt he benefits, while the addressee is by and large unaffected. *Have some more soup* belongs to the second type; this time, the addressee benefits if the command is executed, while it is the speaker who is left unaffected. On the whole, this simple distinction is sufficient for present purposes, although it is of course possible that both speaker and hearer profit (*could you order our starters*), or that actually neither of them does (*could you give my sister a hand*).

As for the second criterion, it is obvious that the characters in Roman comedy have different degrees of authority and power. Some of the relationships can be quite complex, for example in *Asin.* 591–745, where two slaves have got money which their young master needs.

<sup>31</sup> If the same is true in Cicero, there must be a different reason why he hardly ever employs *nē faciās*. See Löfstedt (1966: 132–7) for the loss of the type *nē fēceris* in Late Latin; the Romance languages have not kept any traces of the prohibitive perfect subjunctive anywhere.

<sup>32</sup> The way we speak is of course not only influenced by whom we are speaking to, but also by who else is around and listening to us, as is pointed out by Watts (2003: 113).

In some respects, this reverses the master–slave relationship, while it leaves it unchanged in others; in ll. 619–20, for instance, the slave Leonida mocks his master openly, and in ll. 652–3 the young man is forced to call the slaves his *patrōnī*, but at the same time it is clear that the slaves will help their master eventually and give him the money. In most cases, however, a relatively crude classification is enough. One can distinguish between situations in which an inferior asks a superior to do something, those in which a superior commands obedience, and those in which the speaker and the addressee are equals. However, it should not be forgotten that for example slaves in comedy are not always genuine subordinates, as has been shown clearly by Fraenkel (1960: 223–41); especially in his function as *architectōn dolī*, the slave often has a degree of self-confidence that one would not expect in real life. His braggadocio is expressed in the grandest and most archaic language.

The interplay of the above factors can be illustrated with two English examples:

- (7) Have some more tea, there's plenty left.
- (8) Be quiet, I have to concentrate.

Superficially, Exx. 7 and 8 are quite similar. They consist of commands followed by statements made in justification of them. However, in Ex. 7 it is the addressee who benefits, whereas in Ex. 8 it is the speaker. Thus an assistant could say Ex. 7 to his professor without being impolite or causing any offence, while Ex. 8 would be considered rude and too peremptory. Even adding 'please' would not be enough to tone down the command sufficiently. On the other hand, since it is the addressee who benefits in Ex. 7, there would be no need to give a reason why this command is issued. The statement then becomes itself a politeness formula, suggesting that the addressee would be too modest and considerate to take more if he were not asked to do so.

It has sometimes been claimed that the present subjunctive is more polite than the imperative or the negated perfect subjunctive. Concerning the present subjunctive and the imperative in commands, Don. Ter. Andr. 598 states: *quiēscās: prō 'quiēsce' imperātiūi modī, nē iniūriōsum uidērētur*, 'may you be quiet: instead of "be quiet" in

the imperative mood, in order that it should not seem insulting.’ However, a closer look at the passage from Terence leads to a different result. Here an old man is urging his slave to work towards the moral improvement of his son. The slave says *faciam hercle sēdulō*, ‘honestly, I’ll do my best.’ When the master continues the topic, the slave says *quiēs cās*. This is not a real command; rather, it amounts to ‘be calm, rest assured’, the addressee being the beneficiary. Therefore, it does not seem necessary to be too submissive. The closeness of present subjunctive and present imperative can be seen in *Amph.* 924, where they are co-ordinated: *dā mihi hanc ueniam, ignōsce, irāta nē siēs*, ‘give me this indulgence, forgive me, don’t be angry.’ As far as prohibitions are concerned, Ammann (1927: 339–40) thinks that the present subjunctive is typically used by slaves speaking to their masters in a tone of fear or subservience; the exceptions are verbs without *perfectum* (type *nē imbitās*, ‘don’t go in’) and proverbial expressions. Vairel (1978a: 309) also believes that the present subjunctive is less forceful. To some extent, these theories seem to go back to Elmer (1894: 138): ‘When a man says *ne facias* he is taking a comparatively calm, dispassionate view of an act conceived of as one that will possibly be taking place in the future; *ne feceris*, on the other hand, implies that the speaker cannot abide the thought; he refers to it only for the purpose of insisting that it be dismissed absolutely as one not to be harbored.’ Risselada (1993: 155), on the other hand, argues that the present subjunctive is not milder than the perfect. For Cicero, already Lebreton had shown that the type *nē fēcerīs* is not necessarily harsh (1901: 298).

In theory, the politeness of certain forms could in some way be reflected in the use of words like ‘please’. Risselada (1993: 154) observed that *sīs* and *sōdēs* are combined with imperatives and perfect subjunctives, but not with present subjunctives, whether negated or not.<sup>33</sup> In practice, however, this in itself does not tell us anything about the politeness of the forms as such. It could be the case that the present subjunctive is so polite that it does not require a word for ‘please’, or that it is so rude that the combination with ‘please’ would

<sup>33</sup> Note that words for ‘please’ can occur in statements or questions if they are to be interpreted as directives. Cf. *Most.* 35: *An rūri, quaesō, nōn sunt quōs cūrēs bouēs?*, ‘Please, aren’t there any oxen for you to look after in the country?’ This is almost equivalent to *abī rūs*, ‘go to the country’.

be incongruous.<sup>34</sup> The next two examples show that it is not only the perfect, but also the present subjunctive that is compatible with contexts in which the speakers are deliberately being impolite:

(9) (An old man tells his servant that he does not want anyone to come into the house.)

Atque etiam hoc praedicō tibi:  
sī Bona Fortūna ueniāt, *ne* intrō mīserīs. (*Aul.* 99–100.)

And I also declare this to you: if Good Fortune herself should come, *don't let* her in.

(10) (Trachalio is indignant because Gripus refuses to hand over a bag which he found in the sea while fishing.)

Et uītōrem et piscātōrem te esse, impūre, postulās.  
Vel tē mihi mōnstrāre oportēt piscis quī sīt uīdulus,  
uel quod in marī nōn nātum est neque habēt squāmās *nē ferās*.<sup>35</sup>  
(*Rud.* 990–2.)

You demand to be both a basket-maker and a fisherman, you abomination. Either you ought to show me what a casket-fish is, or you *must not take* what was not born in the sea and has no scales.

In Ex. 9, a master is speaking to his servant. Throughout the whole passage, he is rude to her: in l. 86 he calls her *triuēnēfica* ('treble-dyed witch'), and in l. 93 he threatens to kill her if she does not obey. In Ex. 10, speaker and addressee are both slaves, but Trachalio, the speaker, does not treat Gripus as his equal. In Ex. 10 he uses the vocative *impūre* ('abomination'). Before that, he addressed him as *impudēs* ('shameless individual', l. 981) and *uenēfice* ('poisoner', l. 987), and after our scene he insults him again (*furcifer*, 'villain', in l. 996). In l. 1000 he threatens him with the usual beating for slaves, as if he were his master. Thus either tense can be used in contexts in which the speaker is being impolite; the present subjunctive is certainly not excluded. The fact that it is the speakers who need the addressees'

<sup>34</sup> Rosén (1999: 114) thinks that those forms of prohibition which do take mitigating particles are in themselves, without such particles, less polite than forms which are not normally combined with words for 'please'; put differently, the more polite forms do not take 'please' because they do not need it, while the less polite forms often take it because otherwise they would be too rude.

<sup>35</sup> Because of the preceding infinitive construction, I do not take *nē ferās* as dependent on *oportēt*.

co-operation in Exx. 9 and 10 does not matter here because in Ex. 9 the speaker is a master, and in Ex. 10 he behaves like one.

On the other hand, one also finds both perfect and present subjunctives in contexts in which the speaker is trying to be polite:

(11) (A courtesan has asked a young man to help her, otherwise a soldier will come and take a girl away from her. The man is hesitating, she is trying to make him pity the girl.)

Ill' quidem hānc abdūcēt; tū *nūllus affuerīs*,<sup>36</sup> sī nōn lubēt. (*Bacch.* 90.)

He will take her away. *Don't be there to help* if it displeases you.

(12) (A hanger-on is telling a young man he should not be afraid that a soldier is going to be a serious rival.)

*Neque* īstum *metuās* nē amēt mulier. (*Eun.* 1080.)

*Don't be afraid* that the woman might love him.

In Ex. 11, the courtesan is very keen on the man's help; being impolite is out of the question. Throughout the whole scene she is very coaxing. In Ex. 12, a soldier's hanger-on is trying to persuade a young man to accept the soldier as his rival in a love affair, something which the young man is of course unwilling to do at first. The hanger-on can certainly not afford to be impolite. These examples show that both tenses are possible in polite situations; the perfect is not excluded.

In short, it seems that *nē faciās* and *nē fēcerīs* are neutral with regard to politeness, which consequently does not influence the tense choice. In order to be polite or impolite, speakers resort to means other than tenses.

## Differences in Time Sphere

By their very nature, directives have future reference. This does not mean, however, that temporal differences cannot exist between them. Thus the contrast between the so-called present imperative *fac* and the future imperative *facitō* is usually described as one of immediate

<sup>36</sup> Following Lodge (1924: 51), I take this as a perfect subjunctive rather than a future perfect.

versus distant future, for instance by Vairel-Carron (1975: 233).<sup>37</sup> Ex. 13 is one of the classic cases:

(13) (A merchant has found the house he was looking for.)

*Ī, puere, pultā*

atque ātriēnsem Sauream, sī est intus, *ēuocāto* hūc. (*Asin.* 382–3.)

Go, boy, *knock*, and (then) *call out* here the steward Saurea if he's inside.

Here the servant has to go and knock immediately. Asking Saurea to come, on the other hand, is something that can only be done once he has knocked and enquired if he is inside. Risselada (1993: 129) thinks that such temporal distinctions are the by-product of 'the "conditional" value of these instances of the imperative II, which express directives whose realization is required only when the appropriate circumstances obtain'. In most instances the actual differences between a 'temporal' and a 'conditional' or 'contingent' interpretation are marginal.<sup>38</sup>

Vallejo (1942: 297–8) claims that a similar distinction obtains between *nē faciās* and *nē fēcerīs*. According to him, the types *nē fēcerīs* and *cauē fēcerīs* have the same frequency. By contrast, the type *nē faciās* is said to occur 98 times in Plautus, while *cauē faciās* is attested only eight, not 98, times. The rarity of *cauē faciās* calls for an explanation. As a prohibition with *cauē* 'guard against' is more likely to refer to the distant future than one with *nē*, his conclusion is that this pattern in Plautus could point to an original distribution between prohibitive *faciās* and *fēcerīs* that is based on temporal distinctions: *faciās* could be used for the near and *fēcerīs* for the distant future. This would explain why the type *cauē faciās* is relatively rare compared with *nē faciās*: since *cauē* requires a distant future complement, we do not expect it to be followed by *faciās*, which refers to the near future.

I cannot agree with Vallejo because his figures are different from mine. In Plautus, I have only found seventeen unambiguous prohibitions of the type *nē faciās* used for definite second persons. Thus *cauē faciās* is not disproportionately rare, and the statistical argument collapses. Still, his views seem to receive confirmation from a different

<sup>37</sup> This contrast was also postulated, but not proved, by Riemann (1886).

<sup>38</sup> Diachronically at least, the future imperatives seem to go back to simple imperatives with a cliticized element \*-tōd, which is a pronominal abl. meaning 'from then on'. See also LLF 571–2 and Szemerényi (1953) for further discussion.

side if we contrast the simple commands and prohibitions. In the third person we have *faciat* and *nē faciat* as well as *facitō* and *nē facitō*. Similarly, in the second person *fac* formally corresponds to *nē fac* and *faciās* to *nē faciās*. Moreover, there is also *facitō* (2nd pers.), and we might expect that *nē fēcerīs* should fill the corresponding negative slot.<sup>39</sup>

However, as prohibitions are not simply negated commands, we should not jump to conclusions. The formal correspondences are not mirrored semantically. *Nē fac*, for example, has specific features not shared by *fac*. According to Vairel-Carron (1975), it is inhibitive and means ‘stop doing’, that is, the prohibited action is already in progress.<sup>40</sup> *Fac*, by contrast, does not have the corresponding semantics and simply means ‘do’ rather than ‘continue doing’, which can only be expressed by lexical means; compare *perge porrō dīcere*, ‘continue further to speak’ (*Amph.* 803) or *nē dēstiterīs currere*, ‘don’t stop running’ (*Trin.* 1012). Consequently there is no *a priori* reason why *nē fēcerīs* should be used exclusively for the distant future.

Ammann (1927: 341) does not go so far as to claim that *nē fēcerīs* must refer to the distant future, but he believes that it is always preventive rather than inhibitive. Since both *fac* and *faciās* belong to the present stem, one might then expect *nē faciās* to be inhibitive, like *nē fac*.<sup>41</sup>

Others argue that the difference is partly lexical, partly aspectual. K–St i. 189 state that *nē faciās* was used when the *Aktionsart* was durative, while *nē fēcerīs* was employed when it was momentaneous; this difference is said to be still tangible in many cases in Archaic Latin. H–S 337 agree with K–St and think that this difference may manifest itself in such a way that the present is used for general prohibitions,

<sup>39</sup> There is no *nē facitō* referring to the 2nd pers.

<sup>40</sup> There are few exceptions, e.g. *nei parī mēd* ‘do not take me’ in an inscription on a bowl of the 5th c.; see Vine (1998: 258), Mancini (1997: 25), and Harvey (2000: 170). Cristofani’s alternative reading (1996: 22) without a negative *nei* is less convincing. Inhibitive prohibitions can also be expressed lexically in Archaic Latin, e.g. *mitte male loquī*, ‘stop insulting’ (*Persa* 207). In later Latin, this is the only way to make the inhibitive force explicit.

<sup>41</sup> Risselada (1993: 156) thinks that if there are aspectual differences, *nē fac* and *nē faciās* ought to have the same value. But she herself is doubtful about such aspectual features.

while the perfect is employed for single, definite cases. How much of all this is really true?

H-S are partly correct; it is mostly the present that is found in general proverbs:

(14) (Phormio tells an old man that it is too late to remedy the situation he is in.)

‘*Āctum*’ aiunt ‘*nē agās*.’ (*Phorm.* 419.)

They say: ‘you *ought not to do* done business.’

Here *aiunt* shows that we are dealing with a proverb, compare also the similar phrase *āctum agam* in *Ad.* 232. Consequently *nē agās* is not only addressed to the old man, but to everybody who cares to listen to good advice. The second person is impersonal (‘you’ could be replaced by ‘one’). However, I have not been able to interpret most of the instances along the lines of K-St or H-S. As it is, we must find a different reason why the perfect is not normally used in general prohibitions.

In fact, a closer look at the types *nē faciās* and *nē fēcerīs* shows that there are no obvious aspectual or temporal contrasts. Either type, it seems, can be inhibitive or preventive; and in the latter case, either type can refer to the near future or to a distant, contingent event. In Ex. 15, for instance, the present subjunctive is used inhibitive. In Exx. 16 and 17, on the other hand, it is preventive. In Ex. 16, it is employed for the near future, while in Ex. 17 is used for the distant or contingent future:

(15) (Gnatho is teasing Parmeno because he is in a bad mood.)

*Parmeno*: Quī dum? *Gnatho*: Quia trīstis’s. *Parmeno*: Nīl quidem. *Gnatho*: Nē sīs. (*Eun.* 273.)

*Parmeno*: How do you mean? *Gnatho*: Because you’re grumpy. *Parmeno*: Not at all. *Gnatho*: Stop being grumpy.

(16) (Sostrata is on her way to visit her son’s sick wife. Parmeno advises her not to go.)

*Sostrata*: Nōn uīsam uxōrem Pamphīlī, quom in proxumo hīc sīt aegra?

*Parmeno*: Nōn uīsās? *Nē mittās* quidem uīsēdī causā quemquam.

(*Hec.* 341–2.)

*Sostrata*: Should I not see Pamphilus' wife, even though she lies ill here in the neighbourhood? *Parmeno*: Should you not see her? *Don't* even *send* anyone to see her.

(17) (A servant has been told by his master that he should scold him. The servant is afraid of doing so.)

At enim *nē* tu *expōnās* pugnōs tūōs in imperiō meō. (*Cist.* 235.)

But *don't show* your fists during my reign.

In Ex. 15, the prohibited action has already begun, so the translation 'stop being grumpy' makes sense.<sup>42</sup> In Ex. 16, *Parmeno's* advice does not concern something that is already in progress, nor is it contingent on some other action that has to be carried out before. It is simply general advice for the present situation. In Ex. 17, the present subjunctive refers to some time in the future, as the temporal adverbial *in imperiō meō* shows, which is roughly equivalent to a clause like *dum mihi imperium erit*.

The same distinctions can be observed among the perfect subjunctives:

(18) (A father has seen that his son is depressed. The son denies it, but the father does not retract his words.)

*Nē* sīc *fuerīs*: ilico ego nōn dīxerō. (*Asin.* 839–40.)

*Stop being* like that, and immediately I shall not have said so.

(19) (*Palaestrio* does not want a soldier to interfere while his former mistress, who has fainted, is regaining her consciousness.)

*Ne interuēnerīs*,  
quaesō, dum resipiscit. (*Mil.* 1333–4.)

*Don't interfere*, please, while she is recovering.

(20) (A woman had pretended to be an old man's long lost daughter. Now he has found out that it is not her. She is being impertinent.)

Vbi uolēs pater esse, ibi esto; ubi nōlēs, *nē fuerīs* pater. (*Epid.* 595.)

When you'll want to be my father, be it; when you shan't, *don't be* my father.

<sup>42</sup> That does of course not mean that 'stop being grumpy' is the only possible translation and that *nē* + present subjunctive has to be inhibitive. Notice that in Greek, preventive μή ποιήσης can also be used when the prohibited action has already begun; see McKay (1986: 47).

In Ex. 18, the son has already been sad for some time, so 'stop being depressed' is a reasonable interpretation. Ex. 19 is presumably preventive; the *dum*-clause in the present tense makes it clear that *ne interuēneris* is not used for a later moment in the future. In Ex. 20, the perfect subjunctive must refer to the contingent, distant future: not only is there the *ubi*-clause with a future tense, but there is also the parallelism to the future imperative *estō*.

Thus the contrast between present and perfect subjunctives cannot be purely temporal in Exx. 15–20 above. Nevertheless, there seem to be certain tendencies. Five out of the nineteen definite present subjunctives refer to the distant future. The instances in Plautus are *Cist.* 235 (Ex. 17 above), *Epid.* 145 (assuming that *afferēs* is conjectured correctly in the *nī*-clause in the preceding line), *Epid.* 304 (with a *priusquam*-clause in the future perfect), and *Trin.* 370 (with a conditional clause with future reference; I take *nunc* in the question in the line before as a discourse marker, not in a temporal sense). In Terence there is only *Eun.* 388, where the future reference is shown by the adverbial *post*. In all the other cases, the present subjunctives are non-contingent, and knowledge of the situation shows that they are temporally equivalent to positive present imperatives. Nine out of the twenty-seven perfect subjunctives also refer to the distant future. The obvious instances are *Aul.* 100 (with a conditional clause with future reference), *Bacch.* 90 (parallel to a simple future), *Cist.* 110 (with *sī... ueniēt*, 'if... he shall come', in l. 108, and *nōlitō... inclāmāre*, 'don't... revile', in ll. 108–9), *Epid.* 595 (Ex. 20 above), *Mil.* 572 (with *posthāc* and a relative clause in the future), *Mil.* 573 (like the preceding instance), *Hec.* 79 (with a conditional clause in the future in the same line, and with a parallel future imperative in l. 76), and *Phorm.* 514 (with a conditional clause in the future perfect). *Mil.* 862 presumably also refers to a contingent future time, although it is only knowledge of the situation that tells us so. In the other instances, there is no contingency; this is obvious in *Mil.* 1333–4 (Ex. 19 above), *Poen.* 993 (co-ordination with present imperatives in the preceding line), and *Rud.* 1155 (parallelism to a present imperative). On the whole, the proportions of subjunctives referring to the distant future are roughly the same for present and perfect.

Among the present subjunctives in Plautus and Terence, inhibitive interpretation is possible in eight<sup>43</sup> out of seventeen cases, while among the perfect subjunctives, inhibitive interpretation is possible in only one<sup>44</sup> out of nineteen cases. Since the present can be used inhibitive as well as for the distant future, it is probably unmarked for temporal distinctions. *Nē faciās* simply means ‘don’t do’, and it is the context that tells us whether this ought to be taken inhibitive or preventively. By contrast, the perfect has a clear preference for preventive prohibitions, whether the prohibited action is in the near or the distant future. This could reflect aoristic origin: a perfective form like the aorist is unlikely to have present reference. Consequently there might have been an original contrast between inhibitive *nē fac* and preventive *nē fēcerīs*, whereas *nē faciās* is unmarked.

### Summary

The difference between the types *nē fēcerīs* and *nē faciās* has traditionally been described in various ways. I showed some of the difficulties one has when trying to distinguish between main and subordinate clauses with *nē*, and between prohibitions and wishes. I then presented some statistical information. I attempted to demonstrate that there is a significant pattern of distribution: the perfect subjunctive is virtually restricted to second-person prohibitions, while the present subjunctive can be used for prohibitions both in the second person and in the third. After that I tried to show that the distinction between the *perfectum* and the *īnfectum* is neither one of register nor of politeness. Next, I examined temporal and aspectual contrasts. It turned out that *nē faciās* and *nē fēcerīs* can be used in almost the same way. If there is a difference between the two constructions, it is that *nē fēcerīs* is avoided in inhibitive prohibitions, while *nē faciās* can be inhibitive or preventive.

<sup>43</sup> *Curc.* 539 (twice), *Men.* 502, *Most.* 886a, *Rud.* 992, *Stich.* 319–20, *Eun.* 76, *Eun.* 273 (Ex. 15 above).

<sup>44</sup> *Asin.* 839–40 (Ex. 18 above); in *Mil.* 1333 and *Trin.* 1012, inhibitive interpretation seems less likely.

Can we explain the synchronic patterns of distribution diachronically? The non-past perfect subjunctive in *nē fēcerīs* (2nd pers.) continues old usages of modal forms of aorists. Elsewhere, the perfect subjunctive acquired past or anterior meaning in the history of Latin. In this way, *nē fēcerīs* became an anomaly that did not fit into the regular tense and aspect system. On the other hand, *nē faciat* (3rd pers.) seems to be an innovation and has the tense one would expect for prohibitions. Consequently *nē faciās* (2nd pers.) looks like an attempt to make the system more regular.

However, there is an alternative possibility: it is conceivable that *nē faciās* is as old as *nē fēcerīs*. In the prehistory of Latin, there might have been an aspectual difference between them, although it cannot be recovered from our texts any more. When subjunctival third-person prohibitions were created, *nē fēcerīs* was already an anomaly, and consequently it was *nē faciās* that provided the model for creating *nē faciat*.

There are other indications that *nē faciās* fits better into the synchronic system than *nē fēcerīs*. One of them is the fact that *nē faciās/faciat* received a past counterpart, the 'past jussive' *nē facerēs/faceret*, 'you/he ought not to have done'.<sup>45</sup> Moreover, *nē faciās* has the 'deliberative' subjunctive as its counterpart (cf. *quid faciās?* 'what should one do?' in *Ad.* 431, and *quid tu hīc agās?* 'what should you do here?' in *Ad.* 433). Semantically, the difference between *nōn faciat?* and *nē faciat* is merely that between questioned and stated directive. In fact, K–St i. 181 describe phrases like *quid faciāmus?* as derived from the jussive or 'adhortative' *faciāmus*. H–S 336 are somewhat doubtful because the deliberative subjunctive is negated with *nōn*, not with *nē*. Pace K–St, this cannot be explained as constituent negation. The true reason might be that questions are further removed from prohibitions so that the factual negation seemed more appropriate. However that may be, *nē faciat*, like any statement, may become a question without change of tense or mood. In *fac*, on the other hand, the mood could not remain, and in *nē fēcerīs* the tense would have to be altered.

<sup>45</sup> Strictly speaking, the past jussive is a modalized statement and not a prohibition proper because past events cannot be forbidden. See Blase (1919) and Methner (1921) for the semantics.

PROHIBITIONS WITH FORMS OF *CAVĒRE*

The oscillation between *faciās* (present) and *fēcerīs* (perfect) after *nē* recurs after *cauē*, which is, in fact, a different construction. In main clause prohibitions of the type *nē fēcerīs*, the perfect subjunctive has preserved its archaic non-past meaning. But in Ch. 3, where I discussed the sequence rules, I did not find any non-past perfect subjunctives in subordinate clauses. *Cauē fēcerīs* ought to mean 'guard against having done', which does not make sense. It is normally translated as 'guard against doing'. *Fēcerīs* does not have past reference, just as in *nē fēcerīs*. How can this be explained?

Let us examine the various constructions of *cauēre*. Next to the type *cauē fēcerīs*, we also find examples of regular sequence:

- (21) (Geta implores Hegio for help.)

*Geta*: Sī dēseris tū periimus. *Hegio*: *Caue dīxerīs*:  
neque faciam neque mē satis piē posse arbitrōr. (*Ad.* 458–9.)

*Geta*: If you desert us, we are lost. *Hegio*: *Don't say that*. Neither shall I do so nor do I think I could do so with a clean conscience.

- (22) (Theopropides thinks that his son has paid Simo.)

Tū *caue* quadrāginta accēpisse hinc tē *negēs*. (*Most.* 1025.)

But you, *take care you don't deny* having received forty (*minae*) from us.

- (23) (A young man is angry with his slave because he did not hide his girlfriend from his father.)

Eho tū, eho tū, quīn *cāuistī ne* eām *uidērēt*, uerberō? (*Merc.* 189.)

Hey you, hey you, why *didn't you take care that* he *wouldn't see* her, you scoundrel?

*Caue dīxerīs* in Ex. 21 seems to violate the sequence rules. In Ex. 22, on the other hand, the rules are not violated. The superordinate verb is also the imperative *cauē*. There is no subordinator, and as *cauē* is not a past form, the present subjunctive *negēs* is what we expect. In Ex. 23, the superordinate verb *cāuistī* is a perfect; it takes a *nē*-clause in the imperfect.

In Plautus and Terence, there are twenty-six non-imperative forms of *cauēre* with object clauses in the subjunctive. With the exception of one prohibitive token selecting the simple subjunctive, all these

forms take the subordinator *nē*. The tense usage in the subordinate clauses is completely regular and in accordance with the sequence rules I established in Ch. 3. Seventeen of the forms of *cauēre* are in the present or the future, and all their subordinate clauses are in the present subjunctive. The remaining nine forms are past, and the subordinate clauses are in the imperfect subjunctive.<sup>46</sup>

All the unexpected perfect subjunctives occur after imperatives of *cauēre*, and even here only after the form *cauē*. Now apart from *cauē*, there is only one token of another imperativ form with a subordinate clause in Plautus, *cauētō* (*Asin.* 372), and not a single one in Terence. But Cato has the form *cauētō* seventeen times in his book on agriculture, mostly with *nē*, and each time it selects the present subjunctive. Sometimes more than one subjunctive depends on an imperative. After *cauētō* itself, we find seventeen subjunctives with *nē(ue)* and five without. The form *cauē* occurs twice; once it takes a subordinator and two subjunctives (*agr.* 5. 6), and once it is found without subordinator and one subjunctive (*agr.* 34. 1). The non-imperativ forms are non-past, have *nē* (except for one token<sup>47</sup>), and take five present subjunctives in total.

In Plautus and Terence, there are thirty-seven tokens of *cauē* selecting the subjunctive. *Nē* is absent in thirty-two of them. Bennett (1910: 232) and H-S 529–30 argue that in *cauē ueniās*, *nē* is absent by analogy to the absence of *ut* in *fac ueniās*. This is quite likely. In Plautus and Terence, imperativ forms of *facere* have *ut* in 60 cases (62 subordinate subjunctives), but lack *ut* in 79 cases (80 subordinate subjunctives). The future form *faciam*, which is representative of the non-imperativ forms, has *ut* in 47 tokens (49 subordinate subjunctives), but is without *ut* only twice (2 subordinate subjunctives, *Amph.* 63 and 876). The data for *cauēre* in Plautus and Terence are similar (the numbers of superordinate and subordinate verbs are the

<sup>46</sup> Related forms behave in the same way. The idiom *cautiō est nē*, ‘one must take care lest’, occurs three times in Plautus and Terence, each time with the present subjunctive. After the one token of *praecautōst opus nē*, ‘one has to be on one’s guard lest’, *Merc.* 333–4, we also find the present subjunctive. The same is true of *cautiōrēs sunt nē*, ‘they are more cautious lest’, in *Pseud.* 298, where, however, the subordinate clause does not have to be an object clause, but could also be taken as final.

<sup>47</sup> This is in 66. 1 and has the virtual negative *quam minimum*. Note that Mazzarino emends the superordinate verb to *cauētō* (instead of *cauēt*); if this is correct, all non-imperativ forms without exception have *nē*.

same): there are six imperatival forms with *nē* and 32 without; and there are 26 non-imperatival forms (including *cautus*) with *nē*, but there is only one without (*Cas.* 902).

*Cauē* itself does not always take the perfect subjunctive: in the five tokens of *cauē nē*, only the present subjunctive is employed. Two of them cannot be real periphrastic prohibitions because they select the first and the third persons, but three are periphrastic prohibitions proper, taking the second person singular. Ex. 24 is not a periphrastic prohibition, but Ex. 25 is:

(24) (A slave is drunk, but demands to be treated well by his master.)

Molliter sis tenē mē, *cauē nē cadam*: nōn uidēs me ut madidē madeam?  
(*Pseud.* 1296–7.)

Hold me gently, please, *take care that I don't fall*: don't you see I'm as drunk as a lord?

(25) (A girl and her drunken boyfriend are invited to another drinks party. She does not want him to lie down before they are there.)

*Caue modō nē priūs*<sup>48</sup> in via *accumbās*<sup>49</sup>  
quam illi, ubi lectus est strātus, concumbimus. (*Most.* 326–7.)

Just *take care that you don't lie down* in the street before we have come together there, where a couch has been prepared.

In Ex. 24, the superordinate and the subordinate verb belong to different persons. For this reason, the phrase cannot be a true periphrastic prohibition; note that replacement by *nē* with the perfect subjunctive is impossible. In fact, Ex. 24 consists of a simple prohibition *cauē* selecting an object clause introduced by *nē*. By contrast, Ex. 25 is a periphrastic prohibition proper: both the superordinate verb and the subordinate verb have the same person and number. Instead of *cauē nē accumbās* we could, without changing the meaning substantially, also say *nē accubuerīs*.

Only *cauē* without *nē* can take perfect subjunctives beside the present forms. Table 4.3 shows what is attested in Plautus and Terence.

<sup>48</sup> *Prius* scans as an iamb here because of the diaeresis. In this passage, I follow the reading and scansion in Questa (1995: 260–1).

<sup>49</sup> See Adams (1982: 177–8) for the sexual connotations of *concumbere* and similar words meaning 'sleep with, lie with'.

TABLE 4.3. The constructions of *cauē* without *nē*

|                     | 2nd pers.<br>sg. | 2nd pers.<br>pl. | 1st and 3rd pers.<br>sg. and pl. | Total |
|---------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-------|
| Perfect subjunctive | 15               | 0                | 1                                | 16    |
| Present subjunctive | 8                | 1                | 7                                | 16    |

There are sixteen perfect and sixteen present subjunctives. I shall discuss *cauē* with the perfect subjunctive first. I have already said that *nē* is always absent. This together with the fact that verbal *cauē* would entail a serious breach of the sequence of tenses could be explained if in all these instances *cauē* were deverbalized and had been reanalysed as a prohibitive marker comparable to *nē*.<sup>50</sup> Fifteen of the examples are in the second person singular, one is in the third person singular:

(26) (A hanger-on is speaking to his daughter.)

*Caue sīs tu istuc dīxerīs.* (*Persa* 389.)

*Don't say that, please.*

(27) (An old man warns his slaves not to pay attention to Menaechmus' threats.)

*Caue quisquam quod illic minitētur uostrum floccī fēcerīt.* (*Men.* 994.)

*Let none of you care a straw about what he is threatening.*

Ex. 26 is very much like the normal *nē dīxerīs*. For the third person in Ex. 27 there is only one such parallel in Plautus (*nē... opstiterīt*, 'let him not stand in the way', in *Capt.* 791).<sup>51</sup>

Of course the form *cauē* (without *nē*) does not have to be deverbalized in all contexts. If it takes a second person singular present subjunctive, it may be either verbal or non-verbal:

<sup>50</sup> H-S 339 compare *age* or *em* (from *emere*), which have become interjections, as can be seen from the lack of number agreement, e.g. in *Mil.* 928: *age igitur intro abite*, 'come on now, go off inside'. Yet the development is not towards an interjection, but towards a prohibition marker.

<sup>51</sup> Ex. 27 does not mean 'guard against it, you, that anyone should care a straw'. No particular person is addressed, which would make it difficult to argue that *cauē* is an imperative.

(28) (One old man asks another not to go away too far.)

Sed tū *caue* īn<sup>52</sup> quaesitiōne mihi sīs. (*Cas.* 530.)

But you, *take care* you *are not* someone I have to look for.

Here *cauē* could be either verbal or deverbalized. *Nē* is absent, as in *cauē fēcerīs*, but this does not entail that *cauē* is deverbalized. We may compare *fac ut* + subjunctive and *fac* (without *ut*) + subjunctive; there is no reason why *fac* without subordinator should be deverbalized.

However, *cauē* must be deverbalized if more than one person is addressed and if the subjunctive is in the second person plural. There is one example:

(29) (The speaker of the prologue is drawing a comparison to a game of tug of war.)

*Caue dirrumpātis*, quaesō, sinite trānsigī. (*Poen.* 117.)

*Don't break* it, please, let it be carried through.

The context makes it clear that *cauē* cannot be addressed to one single person; it is used for the whole audience, just like the following imperative plural *sinite*. The disagreement in number between *cauē* and *dirrumpātis* is striking and without parallels.<sup>53</sup> Lodge (1924: 244) thinks that *Men.* 784–5 is a comparable instance: *quotiēns tandēm ēdīxī tibi ut cauērēs neuter ad me irētis cum querimōniā?*, ‘how often did I tell you that you should take care that neither of you should come to me with a complaint?’ Yet there is a crucial difference: in *Men.* 784–5, the speaker is only addressing his daughter; she alone should have taken care that neither she herself nor her husband should complain. It is not before *Men.* 808–9 that the old man goes and speaks to his daughter’s husband. *Cauērēs* is completely verbal and exhibits the expected behaviour. By contrast, no such individual is addressed in *Poen.* 117, where the speaker is talking to the whole audience. The only possible explanation is that the form *cauē* has no verbal force here.

<sup>52</sup> The iambic shortening presupposes that *caue* does not scan as a heavy monosyllable here.

<sup>53</sup> Ex. 27 above lacks agreement in person rather than number. But as *quisquam* is indefinite, special rules of agreement could apply, cf. *aperīte* (2nd pers. pl. imperative) *aliquis* (nom. sg.) in *Merc.* 131.

The seven first and third person present subjunctives going with *cauē* (without *nē*) seem to be similar to Ex. 24 above:

(30) (A woman is shocked by what her son has said.)

Et *caue* posthāc, sī me amās, umquam istuc uerbum ex te *audiam*.  
(*Haut.* 1031.)

And *take care* I *don't* ever *hear* that word from you again if you love me.

There is no person agreement between the superordinate and the subordinated verb. Unlike in Ex. 29 above, however, the easiest explanation is that *cauē* is a simple directive taking an object clause. The reason is that Ex. 30 can hardly be regarded as a self-exhortation, which would be the consequence of having deverbilized *cauē* here. Similarly, *cauē faciat* with the third person subjunctive does not contain deverbilized *cauē* because it is addressed to a second person, who is then supposed to prevent something.

Vallejo (1942: 298) has found only one instance of the type *cauē fēceris* in Cicero, while the present subjunctive is quite frequent. He thinks that Cicero regarded *cauē fēceris* as *una parataxis discordante* and therefore avoided it. This would mean that he analysed *cauē* as a proper verb form again, aligning it with the other forms in the paradigm. The one perfect subjunctive is in *ad Q. fr.* 3. 7 (9). 4 (*cauē, amābō, ... cōgitārīs*, 'please don't think'). However, an argument in favour of Cicero keeping deverbilized *cauē* is the fact that it never takes *nē* when combined with the second person singular present subjunctive, which happens 33 times if we disregard *cauē Catōnī antepōnās nē istum quidem ipsum*, 'don't prefer even this one himself to Cato' (*Lael.* 10), which is a special case; here I do not take *nē... quidem* as a subordinator because it regularly co-occurs with negatives; *cauē* on its own conveys the negative force.<sup>54</sup> *Cauē* with the third person can occur with *nē*,<sup>55</sup> but also without.<sup>56</sup>

In the following sections, I shall mostly be dealing with those cases in which *cauē* must be or may be non-verbal. To sum up, *cauē* must

<sup>54</sup> Cf. *S. Rosc.* 73, where *nē... quidem* means 'even' instead of 'not even' because *nēminem* already contains the negation: *intelligunt nēminem nē minimum quidem malefīcium sine causā ammittere*, 'they understand that no one commits even the smallest crime without reason.'

<sup>55</sup> *Impediant* (*fam.* 16. 12. 5), *perturbent* (*fam.* 16. 12. 5), *terreat* (*ac.* 2. 63).

<sup>56</sup> *Habeat* (*Mur.* 62), *misereat* (*Lig.* 14).

be non-verbal if it selects a perfect subjunctive; it also has to be non-verbal in Ex. 29 above because it is used to address several people. *Cauē* may or may not be verbal if it has a second person singular present subjunctive without *nē*. Anywhere else, *cauē* is fully verbal.<sup>57</sup> I shall first look at the register of the forms in question, then at their politeness. After this, I can again examine whether they are inhibitive or preventive. I shall not discuss whether certain subjunctives dependent on *cauē* prefer one tense over the other—most of the relevant verbs are not frequent enough to allow any conclusions; *dīcere* and *facere* are both relatively frequent, and here *caue...dīxīs* (*Merc.* 484) occurs alongside *caue...dīxerīs* (*Persa* 389), and *caue...faxīs* (*Asin.* 256) alongside *caue...fēcerīs* (*Mil.* 1368).

### Register

Earlier I claimed that neither *nē faciās* nor *nē fēcerīs* is colloquial. If this is correct, any differences in register that might exist between *cauē faciās* and *cauē fēcerīs* cannot be explained by the tenses of the subjunctives as such. They could only be accounted for by the status of *cauē*, which may be verbal in *cauē faciās*, but cannot be so in *cauē fēcerīs*.

I shall restrict myself to Plautus. I divide the instances of *cauē* into three categories: those cases where it has to be verbal, that is those six with *nē* and/or dependent verbs in the first or third person present, those where it may or may not be verbal, in other words those seven tokens with a second person singular present subjunctive without *nē*, and those where it cannot be verbal, that is in the fourteen cases where there are perfect subjunctives, and also in Ex. 29 above.

The numbers of tokens in *senarii* and *cantica* are 1 and 5 for verbal *cauē*, 2 and 5 for possibly verbal *cauē*, and 9 and 6 for non-verbal *cauē*. The figures for the first two categories are not very high, but do not seem to point to any particular register. There is no reason to expect

<sup>57</sup> *Tū* in *tū cauē* + 2nd pers. sg. subjunctive does not force us to take *cauē* as verbal. *Tū* can belong entirely to the subjunctive. Cf. *Cas.* 332, where *cauē* has to be deverbalized because of the following perfect subjunctive: *tu istōs minūtōs caue dēōs floccī fēcerīs*, ‘don’t give a damn about these minor deities.’

anything different, and an examination of the contexts in which the forms occur shows that they are compatible with all kinds of registers.

Non-verbal *cauē*, by contrast, is unusually frequent in senarii. However, one should not make too much of this because the figures are low and the metrical criterion in itself is insufficient. Some of the tokens in spoken verse also appear in contexts where high register is not unusual, for instance *caue dirrumpātis* in *Poen.* 117 or *caue...miseris* in *Aul.* 90, both of which are in prologues. Similarly, *caue...feceris* in *Cas.* 332 is in a scene where Lysidamus compares himself to Jupiter and his wife and the servants to the minor deities. *Caue...feceris* in *Stich.* 285 is in a canticum, but what is interesting about the passage is that the speaker says a few lines before *neque lubēt nisi glōriōsē quicquam prōloquī profectō* (l. 277), ‘and I do not want to say anything at all unless it is in a grandiose fashion.’

In short, it is difficult to determine the register of non-verbal *cauē*. Is a colloquial nuance indicated by the fact that it occurs only once in Cicero, in a letter (*cauē...cōgitārīs*, *Cic. ad Q. fr.* 3. 7 (9). 4)? In the absence of more data it would be dangerous to draw firm conclusions.

### Politeness

If *nē fecerīs* and *nē faciās* do not differ in politeness, the natural expectation is that *cauē fecerīs* and *cauē faciās* are also exchangeable in this respect. Indeed, perfect subjunctives as well as present forms seem to be neutral; they can be used in contexts in which the speakers are being impolite:

(31) (Euclio warns his slave not to let anyone into the house.)

*Caue quemquam aliēnum in aedīs intrō miseris.* (*Aul.* 90.)

*Don't let any stranger into the house.*

(32) (Aeschinus tells his slave to watch him because he might give him a signal.)

*Caue nunciam oculōs ā mēis*<sup>58</sup> *oculīs quōquam dēmoueās tuōs.* (*Ad.* 170.)

Now *don't remove* your eyes anywhere from mine.

<sup>58</sup> Synizesis seems more likely to me than Kauer and Lindsay's iambic shortening.

In Exx. 31 and 32, masters are speaking to their slaves, and in each case it is the master who benefits. Politeness is not required. In fact, Euclio treats his servant with contempt in Ex. 31, as we can see from the surrounding context; see also Ex. 9 above, which is from the same passage. In Ex. 32, Aeschinus is simply telling his slave what to do. He is not rude, but there is no reason to regard this as a polite prohibition either. The next two examples, on the other hand, are in contexts where politeness would be appropriate:

(33) (Stasimus is afraid that his master might be told what he has said. Philto promises to keep it quiet.)

*Stasimus: Caue sīs dīxerīs*

*mē tibi dīxisse hoc. Philto: Dīxisti arcānō satis. (Trin. 555–6.)*

*Stasimus:* Please *don't say* that I've told you this. *Philto:* You've told it secretly enough.

(34) (A slave is praying to Venus for two girls.)

*Te ex conchā nātam esse autumant, caue tu hārum conchās<sup>59</sup> spernās.*

*(Rud. 704.)*

People say you were born from a shell; *don't despise* the shells of these girls.

In Ex. 33 a slave is asking a free man for a favour; throughout the conversation, he may not be subservient, but he is certainly friendly. In Ex. 34 a slave is addressing a prayer to Venus. In the former case, the perfect is used, and in the latter, the present. The slave is clearly the beneficiary in Ex. 33, while the situation is more difficult in Ex. 34 because the slave is not praying for himself. However, as he wants Venus to do something, he can in some way be regarded as the beneficiary. In such contexts, speakers use polite and neutral forms, but obviously not rude ones.<sup>60</sup>

In conclusion, neither *cauē fēcerīs* nor *cauē faciās* can in themselves be considered polite or impolite, just as *nē fēcerīs* and *nē faciās*.

<sup>59</sup> For *concha* as a term for the female genitalia see the OLD. For the same reason, a woman called *Concepción* in Spanish can be addressed as *Conchita* (2nd diminutive), but not as *Concha*. See also Adams (1982: 87–9) on the use of words for 'container' referring to the female pudenda. Nixon (1932: iv. 353) obfuscates the sense of the Latin.

<sup>60</sup> *Sīs* 'please' can also be used ironically in impolite contexts, so it does not tell us much in Ex. 33.

### Inhibitive and Preventive Interpretations

In *cauē nē faciās*, *cauē* cannot be deverbalized. The semantics of *cauē* ('guard against', 'take precautions') entails that the prohibitions cannot be inhibitive. Where *cauē* is deverbalized, this restriction may, but need not be preserved. In the latter case, it could perhaps be possible to use *cauē fēcerīs* and *cauē faciās* for inhibitive prohibitions as well. Concerning the preventive tokens, it might be possible that some refer to the near and others to the distant future.

Since I do not have many data, there can be no clear evidence for features like inhibitive or preventive. I have not found any examples of the type *cauē faciās* that can be interpreted inhibitive, but the number of tokens is limited. There is only one token of the type *cauē fēcerīs* that might be given inhibitive interpretation.<sup>61</sup>

(35) (A master is telling his slave that it is he who has the say in his household, not his wife or family.)

Vnus tibi hic dum propitius sīt Iuppiter,  
tu istōs minūtōs *caue* deōs floccī fēcerīs. (*Cas.* 331–2.)

As long as this one Jupiter here is propitious to you, *do not care* a straw about those minor deities.

Here the slave has already spoken about the power and influence of his master's wife, so the translation 'stop caring' would make sense. But it is also conceivable that the master is merely referring to the future. In most cases there can be no inhibitive interpretation, and the phrases simply refer to the future, regardless of the tense of the subjunctive. Compare *abige aps tē lassitudinem, caue pigritiae praeuorterīs* in *Merc.* 113, 'drive off your tiredness from yourself, don't give priority to your laziness.' The phrase with the present subjunctive is parallel to the present imperative. *Capt.* 439 is similar: *fac fidēle sīs fidēlis, caue fidem flūxam gerās*, 'see to it that you're absolutely faithful, don't have fluctuating faithfulness.' Here the phrase with *cauē* is parallel to the periphrastic *fac ... sīs*.

Both types, *cauē fēcerīs* and *cauē faciās*, should also be usable for the distant future. The perfect subjunctive can indeed be employed in this way, compare *Amph.* 608, where *caue quicquam ... responderīs*, 'don't

<sup>61</sup> Ammann (1927: 342) claims that the type *cauē fēcerīs* is always preventive in Plautus.

reply anything' is posterior to the relative clause *nisi quod rogābō*, 'except what I shall ask.' The examples with the present subjunctive are not so clear, but *Most.* 1025 could refer to the distant future.<sup>62</sup>

In short, inhibitive interpretations seem to be unlikely in most cases. This might be due to chance, but it could equally well be the case that deverbilized *cauē* has preserved features of verbal *cauē*. Reference to the distant future seems to be possible at least for *cauē fēcerīs* (perfect subjunctive), but as this is not a specific semantic feature of *nē fēcerīs* or *nē faciās*, it is probably not one of *cauē fēcerīs* either.

### Summary for *cauē*

In Archaic Latin, both *cauē (nē) faciās* and *cauē fēcerīs* occur. The latter seems to violate the sequence of tenses. However, *cauē fēcerīs* can be explained relatively easily if we assume that *cauē* was grammaticalized as a prohibition marker in certain contexts. Diachronically, *cauē nē faciās* is the original construction, but under the influence of *fac ueniās* instead of *fac ut ueniās*, *nē* was left out. After this, *cauē* was reanalysed: *cauē* (imperative) + *ueniās* > *cauē* (prohibition marker) + *ueniās*. Subsequently, *cauē* began to govern the perfect subjunctive and can be compared with *nē* in some respects. Unlike *nē*, however, *cauē* cannot be a subordinator or take an imperative.

*Cauē faciās* and *cauē fēcerīs* tend to be preventive, which can be explained by the semantics of *cauēre* ('guard against'). But the two prohibitions do not seem to differ in politeness, and it is not entirely clear whether there are any register differences between them.

### CONCLUSIONS

I can now summarize the results of the chapter as a whole. This chapter matters because I want to see how extra-paradigmatic subjunctives are employed in prohibitions (Chs. 7, 9, and 10). In order to do so, it is essential to compare the prohibitions with

<sup>62</sup> This is Ex. 22 above. *Cauē... negēs* is parallel to future tenses in the preceding line.

extra-paradigmatic subjunctives to those with regular forms; both types of subjunctives occur in the same structures, for instance after *nē* or *cauē*. However, while the great variety of prohibitive clauses had never gone unnoticed in the secondary literature, the distinctions between the individual types had not been worked out clearly. This makes a comparison between regular and irregular forms in prohibitions very difficult. For this reason, I tried to examine the differences between prohibitive clauses myself. I began by presenting a typology of directives in Plautus and Terence. Since I am merely interested in those types that also have extra-paradigmatic subjunctives, I largely restricted myself to subjunctival prohibitions introduced by *nē*, *nihil*, etc. on the one hand, and by *cauē* on the other.

In all the types of prohibitions I was looking at, there is a contrast between perfect and present subjunctives in the second person. The question was whether this difference in tense correlates with semantic or pragmatic distinctions. I did not find register differences between *nē fēcerīs* and *nē faciās*. Concerning the politeness of the directives, there do not seem to be any tense-related differences between our types either. Moreover, there are no obvious temporal or aspectual distinctions. The perfect subjunctive is normally used in preventive prohibitions, but the present is not excluded under these circumstances. Regardless of the tense of the subjunctive, prohibitions containing deverbalized *cauē* are more likely to be preventive than inhibitive. Presumably *cauē* 'guard against' preserved its preventive status when it was reanalysed as a prohibition marker.

Since I could not find any clear semantic distinctions between the perfect and the present subjunctive in prohibitions in this way, I looked at the paradigms as a whole in order to find differences in distribution. It is remarkable that the perfect subjunctive is virtually restricted to second-person prohibitions. The present, on the other hand, can be employed in commands as well as in prohibitions, and not only in the second person, but also in the third, that is, it can be used when there is no direct address. The explanation of this phenomenon is historical: *nē* + perfect subjunctive continues the inherited prohibitive type with modal forms of the aorist, which were non-past. But in the history of Latin, the perfect subjunctive assumed past meaning in most contexts by association with the perfect indicative. Non-past *nē fēcerīs* became an anomaly. By contrast, the younger

type *nē faciat* (present subjunctive) fits well into the synchronic tense system. *Nē faciās* (2nd pers. present) seems to be an innovation based on *nē faciat*, an attempt to make the paradigm more regular. Alternatively, *nē faciās* could be as old as *nē fēcerīs*. When third-person prohibitions in the subjunctive were created, the present subjunctive was employed, but not the non-past perfect subjunctive, which stood outside the regular tense system.

It is possible that there are semantic differences between *nē faciās* and *nē fēcerīs*. This could explain an observation made by Risselada (1993: 143–4): directives in the present subjunctive are preferred over the imperative or negated perfect subjunctive in two contexts. First, there are reactions to questions of the type *quid faciam?* Compare *quid faciam?*—... *dēueniās*, ‘what should I do?—...you should go’ (*Cist.* 301). And second, there are directives that are the culmination of some preceding argumentation (type *proinde nē faciās*). Compare *nōn potest triōbolum hinc abesse. Proin tū uel aiās uel negēs*, ‘not one farthing may be missing; so you should say either yes or no’ (*Rud.* 1330–1).<sup>63</sup> If such differences exist, they are too subtle to allow me to find out whether *nē faxīs* is closer to *nē faciās* or *nē fēcerīs*. In many contexts, *nē faciās* can substitute for *nē fēcerīs* and *vice versa*. This forces me to rely exclusively on distributional criteria when analysing the extra-paradigmatic subjunctives.

The patterns of distribution are very clear and might help with *nē faxīs*:

1. The perfect is restricted to prohibitions, while the present occurs in commands as well.
2. The perfect is almost only used for the second person, whereas the present is frequent in the third.
3. *Cauē* without *nē* can govern either tense, but *cauē* with *nē* only takes the present.<sup>64</sup>

<sup>63</sup> For the first of these observations see also Thomas (1938: 123): ‘Le type *nē faciās* est également une forme atténuée de la défense; il marque un conseil, une prière de ne pas faire telle chose, et non pas une action qui dure, comme le voulait Delbrück.’ With the last example one can also compare the explicit *an nāta est spōnsa praegnās? Vel ai uel negā*, ‘has my fiancée been born pregnant? Yes or no!’ (Naeu. *com.* 125).

<sup>64</sup> *Cauē* without *nē* can be deverbilized and introduce main clause prohibitions, while *cauē* with *nē* introduces subordinate clauses. It is only in some main clauses that the perfect subjunctive has preserved its original non-past meaning, while in

I can now try to find out if *nē faxīs*, *nē duīs* etc. have any of the restrictions that the perfect has (Chs. 7, 9, and 10). This will help me to see if they are closer to *nē fēcerīs* or to *nē faciās*. First, however, I shall consider in Ch. 5 one last problem that will be relevant for the extra-paradigmatic forms; this is the problem of tense usage in ACIs.

subordinate clauses it always indicates anteriority, which explains why it is excluded from *cauē nē* + subjunctive. If an extra-paradigmatic form is close to the perfect subjunctive, but has retained its non-past meaning, it should in theory follow the first two restrictions above, but not the third.

## Infinitivals with Future Meaning in Archaic Latin

ARCHAIC Latin has a number of sigmatic infinitives such as *impetrāss-ere* (from *impetrā-re* ‘to obtain through prayer’). With one exception they occur in *accūsātīuus cum īnfīnītīuō* (AcI) constructions with future reference. In Classical Latin, the only infinitive that can be found under these circumstances is the future infinitive, and one might be tempted to conclude that *impetrāssere* is simply an archaic future infinitive. This is in fact the stance most scholars take on the subject. However, in Archaic Latin the future infinitive alternates with the present infinitive in AcIs with future reference, and for this reason it seems rash to call the sigmatic infinitive a future form. The sigmatic infinitive can only be compared with other infinitives fruitfully if their patterns of alternation in AcIs have been explained. This is my aim in this chapter. I shall try to elucidate the tense usage in such AcIs; in particular, I shall discuss in more detail what regular forms occur under what circumstances. This will be crucial for the discussion of the sigmatic infinitives in Ch. 8, where I shall compare their usage with that of the regular infinitives.

Among the infinitive constructions, the AcI is perhaps the most striking and presents the greatest number of problems. In recent years, the construction has attracted much attention from general linguists because it occurs not only in Latin, but also in many European and non-European languages. In the majority of the European languages, however, the Latin AcI has played a role either in the development or at least in the expansion of this construction.<sup>1</sup> Most

<sup>1</sup> For English see Fischer (1992: 340–3).

of the problems associated with the AcI cannot even be mentioned in passing, but see Pinkster (1990: 57–8 and 126–30) and Bolkestein (1976, 1979) for Latin, and Dik (1997: ii. 145–54) for a treatment of the AcI within a Functional Grammar framework. The AcI is of course also dealt with in Transformational Grammar. Roberts (1997: 127–33) has a discussion of general restrictions concerning pronouns in infinitival clauses. Pillinger (1980) argues convincingly that the Latin AcI should not be derived by Subject-to-Object Raising.<sup>2</sup> For the diachronic side see Lühr (1993: 242) and Hettrich (1997: 226). For Oscan and Umbrian see Buck (1928: 221) and von Planta (1897: 438).<sup>3</sup>

Informally, the AcI could be defined as a non-finite subordinate clause without subordinator; the subject of this clause is in the accusative and is usually referred to as the ‘subject accusative’.<sup>4</sup> AcIs can for instance depend on verbs of speech such as *dīcō*. Examples might clarify how the AcI works:

(1) *Mārcus uēnit*.

Mark has come.

(2) *Dīcō Mārcum uēnisse*.

I am saying that Mark has come.

Ex. 1 is an ordinary finite sentence. *Mārcus*, the subject, is in the nominative, and the verb *uēnit* agrees with it in person and number. In Ex. 2, the same statement depends on the verb *dīcō* ‘I am saying’. *Vēnit*, the finite verb in Ex. 1, is turned into an infinitive, and the subject *Mārcus* goes into the accusative case, *Mārcum*.

In Latin, infinitives, like finite verbs, have tense. If a finite clause is turned into an AcI, the tense of the infinitive is determined by the tense of the finite verb:

<sup>2</sup> Subject-to-Object Raising means that the subject of a subordinate clause is extracted or ‘raised’ out of that clause so as to become the object of the main clause.

<sup>3</sup> The AcI must have developed or at least spread independently in Latino-Faliscan and Osco-Umbrian because Proto-Italic does not appear to have had fully grammaticalized infinitives.

<sup>4</sup> The typical subject case is of course the nom. It cannot be used because it might be misinterpreted as the subject of the finite verb. For reasons why the acc. is better suited as subject than the other oblique cases see Pillinger (1980: 70) and Pinkster (1990: 57–8).

(3) (a) *Mārcus uēnit.* → *Dīcō Mārcum uēnisse.*

Mark has come. → I am saying that Mark has come.

(b) *Mārcus uēnit.* → *Dīcō Mārcum uenīre.*

Mark is coming. → I am saying that Mark is coming.

(c) *Mārcus ueniet.* → *Dīcō Mārcum uentūrum esse.*

Mark will come. → I am saying that Mark will come.

In (a), the past tense is rendered by the perfect infinitive. In (b), the present tense is turned into the present infinitive. And in (c), the future tense is reflected by the future infinitive.<sup>5</sup> In Classical Latin, these rules are relatively strict, and consequently there is agreement between tense and time reference: the perfect infinitive stands for anterior events, the present infinitive is employed for simultaneous ones, and the future infinitive is used for posterior ones.<sup>6</sup>

As I pointed out before, there are ACIs containing sigmatic infinitives in Archaic Latin:

(4) (An old man believes that he will soon get back his son, a captive.)

*Illum cōnfidō domum*

*in hīs diēbus mē reconciliāssere.* (*Capt.* 167–8.)

I am confident that I *shall* get him *back* home in a few days.

Here *reconciliāssere* has future reference, and the same is true of the other sigmatic infinitives in ACIs. If we knew only Classical Latin, we should naturally assume that *reconciliāssere* was a future infinitive. But does *reconciliāssere* need to be a future form? In Archaic Latin, the rules for the tenses of the infinitives seem to be somewhat different:

(5) (Tranio urges his master Theopropides to pay an obstinate money-lender.)

*Tranio: Dīc tē datūrum, ut abeāt. Theopropides: Egōn dīcam dare?*

(*Most.* 633.)

*Tranio: Say that you will give* (future infinitive), so that he goes away.

*Theopropides: I am to say that I give* (present infinitive)?

<sup>5</sup> Note that infinitives, unlike finite verb forms, can only express relative, not absolute time. The Latin infinitive has three relative tenses expressing anteriority, simultaneity, and posteriority. In what follows, I shall employ the traditional terminology and speak of ‘present’ and ‘future’ infinitives.

<sup>6</sup> There are few exceptions. According to Landgraf (1914: 35), the present infinitive can replace the future form so as to avoid too many forms in *-tūrum* (*esse*).

Ex. 5 contains two AcIs with future reference dependent on the same verb *dīcere* ‘to say’; but the first AcI has a future tense infinitive with subject accusative, and the second has a present tense form without accusative.<sup>7</sup> Evidently, the present infinitive can have future reference in Archaic Latin, for the act of giving has not even begun yet; it seems less likely to me that the speaker is here imagining himself in the future as actually handing over the money. Neither here nor in the other examples can I detect purely temporal differences, for instance of the kind that the present infinitive refers to the near future and the future infinitive to a more distant time. Ex. 5 looks like a classic case of conjunction reduction:<sup>8</sup> it could be argued that the future infinitive *datūrum* unambiguously establishes future reference so that in the master’s reply an unmarked present infinitive is sufficient. However, in most cases no future infinitive precedes, and it is merely knowledge of the situation that enables us to tell whether a present infinitive has present or future force.

To put it more generally, future infinitives always have future reference in Archaic Latin, just as in Classical Latin, but present infinitives can be used for either the present or the future. In other words, the present infinitive has a greater sphere of usage in Archaic than in Classical Latin.

This raises the question of whether *reconciliāssere* is more like the future or the present infinitive. If *reconciliāssere* is like future infinitives, it must always have future reference. If it is like present infinitives, not only future, but also present reference is possible. The absence of infinitives like *reconciliāssere* with present force would then be due to chance.

I can only hope to answer my question if I can find out whether the alternation between future infinitives and present infinitives with future meaning is random or determined by certain factors. This is the main purpose of the present chapter. Some of the factors which

<sup>7</sup> If there is no acc., it may be strange to speak of an AcI or *accūsātīuus cum īnfīnītīuō*, ‘accusative with infinitive’; the term ‘prolative infinitive’ might be considered more appropriate. I have retained the term AcI in order not to complicate matters.

<sup>8</sup> The term is frequently used in Sanskrit grammars to refer to co-ordinated structures in which the first element is marked for tense, while the second is in the atemporal injunctive and gets the same temporal interpretation as the first.

might be of importance and which can be found in the literature are the following:

1. The semantics of the infinitive; are there verbs that are more often in the present infinitive with future reference?
2. The voice of the infinitive; has the choice of active or passive any influence on the choice of tense?
3. The presence or absence of the subject accusative; does the absence of a subject accusative in the answer in Ex. 5 necessitate or facilitate the use of the present infinitive?
4. The register of the passage involved; is the present infinitive with future meaning colloquial?
5. The semantics of the governing verb; do some verbs prefer present tense infinitives with future meaning, while others require future tense forms?
6. The time of writing; is there diachronic change, with Terence closer to the classical usage than Plautus?

I shall discuss all of these points below, but I shall first examine two other factors; they are not dealt with in the secondary literature, even though they are of the greatest importance: first, is the AcI telic? And second, is the subject of the AcI the same as that of the superordinate verb?

In order to get a representative sample of relevant AcIs, I examined all the AcIs in Plautus and Terence that depend on the following verbs listed in Bennett (1910: 426–7): *adiūrō*, *aiō*, *arbitror*, *audiō*, *autumō*, *cēseō*, *dēnegō*, *dīcō*, *interminor*, *iūrō* (with *iūs iūrandum dō*), *minor*, *negō*, *polliceor*, *prōmittō*, *reprōmittō*, *sciō*, *spērō*, and *uoueō*.<sup>9</sup> I also added *cōnfidō* and *crēdō* to the list, which increases the number of superordinate verbs to twenty.

## TELICITY

It is a strange fact that scholars examining the use of present infinitives with future force have hardly paid any attention to the semantics

<sup>9</sup> I left out *annuō*. It is in Bennett's list and bears some relation to the *uerba dicendī*, but has no relevant material in Terence and is not even attested in Plautus.

of the infinitives themselves. However, it is the semantics of the infinitives, together with their complements, which will turn out to be the single most important factor determining the choice between future infinitives and present infinitives with future force.

The distinction which will be crucial is that between telic and atelic events.<sup>10</sup> By 'events' I mean verbs in combination with their complements. Two examples will make the difference between telic and atelic clearer:

(6) *Mark is running home.*

(7) *Mark is running.*

*Running home* in Ex. 6 is telic because it has a clearly definable end: once Mark has reached home, he has completed the activity I was talking about. By contrast, if there is no surrounding context indicating the opposite, *running* in Ex. 7 is atelic because it does not have such an endpoint. Of course no one would assume that Mark will be running for ever, so there will be an end of some sort, but the statement is true as soon as Mark has started to run; he does not have to complete any special task.

The easiest way of finding out whether a verb with its complements is telic or not is the 'interruption test':

(8) *Mark stopped running home.*  $\Rightarrow$  He has not (yet) run home.

(9) *Mark stopped running.*  $\Rightarrow$  He has run.

In Ex. 8 I am interrupting a telic event. This entails that it has not reached its endpoint and that the statement 'Mark has run home' would be false. In Ex. 9 I am interrupting an atelic event. Even if Mark does not continue his run afterwards, the statement 'Mark has run' is true.

The distinction between telic and atelic events in Latin and English can sometimes be problematic, but on the whole the number of cases where a decision between telic and atelic is difficult is not too great. Exx. 10 and 11 are Latin instances of this distinction:

<sup>10</sup> It is discussed in Dik (1997: i. 108–11), who also cites a number of tests that help to distinguish between telic and atelic events. Other semantic parameters, such as dynamic and non-dynamic, or momentaneous and non-momentaneous, do not matter here. Note that telicity entails that an event is also dynamic.

TABLE 5.1. AcIs with present and future reference: telic and atelic events

|  | Telic | Atelic | Total | Atelic AcIs (%) |
|--|-------|--------|-------|-----------------|
| Present infinitives with present reference           | 87    | 637    | 724   | 87.98           |
| Future and present infinitives with future reference | 185   | 104    | 289   | 35.99           |
| Total  | 272   | 741    | 1013  | 73.15           |

(10) (Phaedromus wants to take Therapontigonus to court.)

*Phaedromus: Ambula in iūs. Therapontigonus: Nōn eō.* (Curc. 621.)

*Phaedromus: Go to court. Therapontigonus: I'm not going.*

(11) (Cappadox is telling Palinurus about his bad health.)

*Cappadox: Lien diērēctust. Palinurus: Ambula, id lienī optumumst.*  
(Curc. 244.)

*Cappadox: My spleen is in a terrible state. Palinurus: Go for a walk, that's best for your spleen.*

In Ex. 10, *ambulā* has an endpoint, namely the court, and so it is telic. In Ex. 11, *ambulā* means 'go for a walk' and consequently it has no inherent endpoint, even though Cappadox is not supposed to go on walking for ever.

It can be shown that AcIs with present infinitives and present reference are by and large atelic, while AcIs with future reference are more frequently telic than atelic, regardless of whether the future or the present tense is used. Table 5.1 presents the relevant data after the twenty superordinate verbs in Plautus and Terence.

AcIs with present force are atelic in almost 90% of all the cases, while AcIs with future reference are telic in around 64% of all the tokens.<sup>11</sup> At first sight this finding may look surprising, but it can be explained relatively easily if one considers what situations AcIs with present and with future force normally describe. At least in my corpus, AcIs with present reference are predominantly used not to talk about activities, but about states and ongoing situations (*be here, be tired, be angry* etc.); unlike actions, states and situations are most

<sup>11</sup> A t-test shows that the likelihood that this pattern is statistically significant is higher than 99.95%.

frequently atelic. AcIs with future force, on the other hand, more often than not refer to actions, which are prototypically telic.

If we now look at the AcIs with future reference in more detail, we can find all combinations of telicity and tense. There are telic future infinitives (Ex. 12), atelic future infinitives (Ex. 13), telic present infinitives with future reference (Ex. 14), and atelic present infinitives with future reference (Ex. 15):

- (12) (Phaedromus is waiting for Curculio.)

Cōnfidō parasitum hodie *aduentūrum*  
cum argento ad mē. (*Curc.* 143–4.)

I'm sure my hanger-on *will arrive* at my place today with money.

- (13) (Agorastocles is confident that he will achieve his goals.)

Egoquidem meōs amōrēs mēcum cōnfidō *fore*. (*Poen.* 1165.)

I'm sure my darling *will be* with me.

- (14) (Trachalio is complaining about a pimp.)

Sciūi lēnōnem *facere* ego hoc quod fēcit; saepe dīxī. (*Rud.* 376.)

I knew the pimp *would do* what he did; I often said so.

- (15) (Daemones is annoyed by Trachalio's prolix entreaty.)

At egō tē per crūra et tālōs tergumque optestōr tuom,  
ut tibi ulmeam ūberem *esse* spērēs uirgidēmiam  
et tibi ēuentūram hōc annō ūberem messem malī,  
ut mi istuc dicās negōtī quid sīt quod tumultuēs. (*Rud.* 635–8.)

But I beseech you by your shins, your ankles and your back, as you're hoping *to have* a rich harvest of elm rods, and as you're hoping to get a rich gathering of blows this year, that you should tell me what this business of yours is because of which you're creating such an uproar.

In Exx. 12 and 13 there are future infinitives. *Aduentūrum* in Ex. 12 is telic because there is a clear endpoint; as soon as Curculio arrives, this endpoint has been reached. *Fore* in Ex. 13 describes a situation without a clearly definable end; in fact, Agorastocles probably does not expect there to be an end at all. Exx. 14 and 15 both contain present infinitives with future force, and in Ex. 15 this present infinitive is combined with a future infinitive proper, *ēuentūram*. The present infinitive in Ex. 14 is telic. Trachalio is referring to a specific deed, and such a deed must have an endpoint. *Esse* in Ex. 15, however,

TABLE 5.2. AclS with future reference: telic and atelic events

|   | Telic | Atelic | Total | Atelic<br>AclS (%) |
|---|-------|--------|-------|--------------------|
| Future infinitives                        | 111   | 98     | 209   | 46.89              |
| Present infinitives with future reference | 74    | 6      | 80    | 7.5                |
| Total                                     | 185   | 104    | 289   | 35.99              |

is atelic. The harvest will of course be over after some time, but this endpoint is not specified and is irrelevant here.

These examples show that several combinations of tense and telicity are possible with future meaning. However, not all of them are equally frequent, and we can observe a remarkable pattern of distribution (Table 5.2).

Future infinitives are used regardless of whether the event is telic or not, whereas present infinitives with future reference are more or less restricted to telic AclS.<sup>12</sup> There are only six exceptions. One of them is the infinitive *licēre* in *Haut.* 103, a verb which does not normally have a future infinitive. Other than that, we find four tokens of *esse* (*Persa* 260, *Rud.* 636 = Ex. 15 above, *Truc.* 936, and *Eun.* 275) and one of *ferre* (*Asin.* 699) with future force, and both of these are frequent verbs. Among the telic events, the present infinitive with future meaning is quite frequent in Plautus and Terence: 74 out of 185 telic infinitives with future reference are in the present tense, which amounts to 40%.

How did this pattern come about? Infinitives are relatively recent innovations in the Indo-European languages,<sup>13</sup> and verbal nouns were probably not yet fully grammaticalized as infinitives in Proto-Italic; note that the infinitives of Oscan and Umbrian have different endings from the Latin ones. But while the present infinitive endings of Latin can be given sensible etymologies by comparing them with

<sup>12</sup> The likelihood that this finding is statistically significant is higher than 99.95%, as can be shown by a t-test.

<sup>13</sup> The traditional view is that Indo-European did not have infinitives. It was challenged by Rix (1976), but García Ramón (1993) demonstrated that his position was untenable. However, Indo-European had certain verbal nouns and adjectives, e.g. the forms in *-tō-*. Such forms seem to have been neutral with regard to voice (Coleman 1985b: 211) as well as tense and aspect (Coleman 1985a: 308).

case forms of cognate languages,<sup>14</sup> the future infinitives have no such analogues. The future infinitives seem to have been created within Latin itself, after the present infinitives.<sup>15</sup> It is a reasonable assumption that before the creation of future infinitives the 'present' infinitive was a non-past infinitive; in other words, the present infinitive could be used for both present and future events.<sup>16</sup> After the advent of future infinitives, the present infinitive was being more and more restricted to events with present reference.

This restriction process was of course not completed overnight. But why did it take place in the way it did? Why did the future infinitives replace the atelic present infinitives with future force almost completely, while this process is anything but complete among the telic events? Here it might be helpful to look at the data in Table 5.1 again. There is a robust pattern of distribution: of the 1011 infinitives, 270 are telic and 741 are atelic. Of the 270 telic infinitives, only 31.48% (85 tokens) have present reference, while 68.52% (185 tokens) have future reference (future or present tense). Of the 741 atelic infinitives, 85.96% (637 tokens) have present reference, but only 14.04% (104 tokens) have future reference (future or present tense). Thus situations with endpoints are somewhat more likely to have future reference than those without, whereas situations without endpoints are far more likely to have present reference than those with endpoints. In a stage of pre-Latin where there were no future infinitives yet, there must have been the frequency pattern presented in Table 5.3.

When future infinitives were introduced, they naturally replaced the very rare atelic present infinitives with future force before the frequent telic present infinitives with future force. In Archaic Latin,

<sup>14</sup> The traditional view about forms like *dicere* (LLF 580–1 or Meiser 1998: 225) is that they are derived from locatives of verbal nouns in \*-es-. A different explanation (aorist \*-s- and a dat. variant \*-i) can be found in Blümel (1979: 79–81). Oscan *deicum* goes back to an acc.

<sup>15</sup> For the future passive infinitive see Coleman (1985b: 211–12). For the future active infinitive see Postgate (1894, 1904), LLF 316, 618, and Blümel (1979: 104–6).

<sup>16</sup> Oscan and Umbrian might have preserved this archaic state; it is unclear whether they had ever developed future active infinitives. There are no obvious examples of Osco-Umbrian future passive infinitives either; *erom ehiato* in the Iguvine table vii. b 2 might conceivably be one (see Olzscha 1963: 81, Rix 1976: 236, and Untermann 2000: 200–1 for different interpretations). Note that the Latin equivalent is formed with *irī*, not *esse*, which is problematic in itself.

TABLE 5.3. Telicity, time reference, and frequency in pre-Latin infinitivals

|                   | Telic    | Atelic    |
|-------------------|----------|-----------|
| Present reference | Rare     | Frequent  |
| Future reference  | Frequent | Very rare |

this first process is almost completed, while the second process, the replacement of telic present infinitives with future reference by future infinitives proper, is still in progress.

The synchronic and diachronic patterns are clear, and the replacement processes have to do with the relative frequencies of combinations of telicity and time reference. But why are there these patterns of frequency? What is the ultimate semantic reason behind them?

Perhaps a few English examples can help to clarify why these patterns exist.<sup>17</sup>

(16) (At a party:) I think John is leaving.

(17) (At a party:) I think John is going to leave.

(18) (During a holiday at the seaside:) I think John is swimming.

(19) (During a holiday at the seaside:) I think John is going to swim.

In the situational contexts given in brackets, *leave* is telic, whereas *swim* is atelic. In Ex. 16 John has probably made an overt move to leave, while in Ex. 17 he is less likely to have done so. However, in neither Ex. 16 nor Ex. 17 has he actually left yet, and in many contexts the two sentences can be used interchangeably; *John has left* will only be true in the future. Exx. 18 and 19, on the other hand, cannot be employed in the same contexts. In Ex. 18 John is already swimming, while in Ex. 19 he has not yet started. *John has swum* follows from Ex. 18, but not from Ex. 19.

The reason for the difference in behaviour between telic and atelic verbs is that only telic ones like *leave* entail that there is an endpoint, and this endpoint can never be exactly simultaneous with the superordinate verb. Thus when I am asserting that *I think John is leaving*, I am merely saying that the process leading to John's departure has

<sup>17</sup> I am grateful to Scott DeLancey for discussing these sentences with me.

TABLE 5.4. Tenses and the subjects of the infinitives

|                   | Future<br>infinitives | Present infinitives<br>with future force | Total | Present infinitives<br>with future force (%) |
|-------------------|-----------------------|--|-------|--|
| Same subject      | 65                    | 62                                       | 127   | 48.82  |
| Different subject | 144                   | 18                                       | 162   | 11.11  |

begun, but not that the departure can already be asserted. Similarly, in *I think John is going to leave* the departure cannot be asserted yet.

It is only natural that when future infinitives in *-ūrum* (*esse*) were created, they were first used for atelic verbs because here the difference between simultaneity and posteriority is much clearer and much more important. The expansion of the new morphology to telic verbs belongs to a period when it was already obligatory among the atelic ones.<sup>18</sup>

## THE SUBJECT OF THE INFINITIVE

Apart from telicity, there is another important factor which has not been considered by those looking at the tense usage in AcIs: sometimes the subject of the AcI is identical with that of the superordinate verb, and sometimes it is not. Does this correlate with the choice between future infinitive and present infinitive with future force? I shall again look at the AcIs dependent on the twenty superordinate verbs in Plautus and Terence. Table 5.4 offers a preliminary answer.

The present infinitive with future force is in proportion much more frequent if the AcI and the superordinate verb have the same subject than if there is a different subject.<sup>19</sup> Can this result be

<sup>18</sup> At the end of this discussion it should at least be pointed out that the future infinitive *fore* is, from a morphological perspective, a present infinitive. The grammaticalization of *fore* as a future infinitive seems to have to do with the fact that the root *\*b<sup>h</sup>uH<sub>x</sub>-* 'become' is telic; see also Hewson and Bubenik (1997: 206) on *fore*. In Medieval Latin *fore* became a present again, presumably on the analogy *essem: forem:: esse: fore*.

<sup>19</sup> As the t-test shows, the likelihood that the pattern of Table 5.4 is statistically significant is higher than 99.95%.

TABLE 5.5. Tenses of telic ACIs and the subjects of the infinitives

|                   | Future<br>infinitives | Present infinitives<br>with future force | Total | Present infinitives<br>with future force (%) |
|-------------------|-----------------------|--|-------|--|
| Same subject      | 50                    | 61                                       | 111   | 54.95  |
| Different subject | 62                    | 13                                       | 75    | 17.33  |

explained differently? Is it just a symptom of something else? Is it for instance possible that the true reason for this distribution is that there are more telic ACIs if the subjects are the same? In Table 5.5 I exclude all atelic ACIs.

Table 5.5 demonstrates that among the telic ACIs, the present infinitive with future reference really is far more frequent if the ACI has the same subject as the superordinate verb than if it has a different subject.<sup>20</sup> However, this is not an absolute restriction. There are a number of ACIs where the subjects do not agree, but which nevertheless have the present tense with future force. By contrast, the restriction of the present tense with future force to telic ACIs is almost without exceptions.

How can this second restriction be explained? There seem to be two factors at work. Givón (2001: 50) argues that cross-linguistically two clauses tend to be more closely connected with each other syntactically if they share syntactic constituents than is otherwise the case. The more tightly a subordinate clause is connected with a main clause, the more likely it is to be non-finite, and the more likely it is to allow fewer tense distinctions. This phenomenon is of course also known from Latin: we say *uolō ut dēs* with a finite *ut*-clause because the subject of *uelle* is different from that of *dare*, but we say *uolō dare* with a plain infinitive when the two subjects are the same. So it is perhaps not surprising that the distinction between present and future infinitive is more regularly made if the subjects of the superordinate verb and of the infinitive differ, and that there is a strong tendency to use only the present infinitive if the two subjects are identical.

<sup>20</sup> The likelihood that this finding is statistically significant is higher than 99.95%, as can be demonstrated by a t-test.

TABLE 5.6. The correlation between present and future reference and the subjects

|                   | Present infinitives,<br>present force | Future or present<br>infinitives, future force | Total | Infinitives with<br>future force (%) |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------|--|-------|--------------------------------------|
| Same subject      | 149                                   | 127  | 276   | 46.01                                |
| Different subject | 575                                   | 162  | 737   | 21.98                                |

The second factor is less obvious and concerns the correlation between future time reference and identity of subjects. Here it might be helpful to take the AcIs with present reference into account (Table 5.6).

My text sample is limited and only considers reported speech with present and future reference. Here, irrespective of grammatical person, people are more than twice as likely to refer to the future when talking about themselves than when talking about other people or things.<sup>21</sup> Consequently when they are talking about others, the present tense is more likely to have present reference than when they are talking about themselves. Thus the present tense with future reference is more marked if there is a difference of subjects than if the subjects are the same. The present tense with future force is first replaced where it is more marked, that is, where the subjects are not identical. It is beyond the scope of this book to examine the question whether this is a pattern that recurs in unrelated languages; at least to my mind the question how given the members of a particular society are to talk about what they intend to do is a social rather than a linguistic one.

### THE INFINITIVE DARE

There is one phenomenon that cannot go unnoticed: among the present infinitives with future force, *dare* is especially frequent. This was also observed by Sjögren (1906: 57, 59), who says that among the 50 present infinitives with future force in Plautus there are 18

<sup>21</sup> As the t-test shows, the likelihood that this pattern is statistically significant is higher than 99.95%.

TABLE 5.7. *Dare*: infinitives with future reference

|                   | Future infinitives | Present infinitives, future meaning | Total | Present infinitives (%) |
|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Same subject      | 13                 | 25                                  | 38    | 65.79                   |
| Different subject | 7                  | 8                                   | 15    | 53.33                   |
| Total             | 20                 | 33                                  | 53    | 62.26                   |

tokens of *dare*. However, Sjögren does not tell us if *datūrum* is equally frequent among the future infinitives, in which case there would be nothing special about this verb.

All the future, but not all the present forms of *dare* are important. Every future form has to be counted because the future infinitive can only be used in AcIs where other tense forms, with other temporal meanings, can be used as well. The present infinitive, on the other hand, does not always contrast with other tenses and is, in fact, often the only possible tense choice. This is the case for example after *soleō*, where both in Archaic Latin and in the classical language infinitives other than those of the present tense are impossible. Here the present tense is completely irrelevant for my purposes.

If I exclude those tokens, I am left with forms of *dare* in AcIs after *uerba dicendī, sentiendī, and affectūs*, for example *iūrō, censeō, and grauiter ferō*. These AcIs can have different tenses. The data for future infinitives and present infinitives with future meaning after such verbs are displayed in Table 5.7.

The results are clear. For the verb *dare*, the present infinitive with future force is more common than the future form, whether the subject of the AcI is the same as that of the superordinate verb or not. This means that there is a marked tendency for the verb *dare* to express future reference through the present infinitive. For other telic verbs, this tendency is strong if the two subjects are the same (present infinitives make up 54.95%), but not if the two subjects differ (present infinitives make up 17.33%).

How can this phenomenon be explained? As the Latin future infinitives seem to be a recent innovation that does not even go back to Proto-Italic, it is perhaps only to be expected that some verbs should at least partly have escaped regularization. The fact that *dare*

with future meaning is virtually always telic<sup>22</sup> may have played a role; other verbs like *īre* are either atelic or telic, depending on their complements. What is perhaps equally important is the high frequency of the verb *dare*, which must have helped to preserve archaic patterns.

## THE VOICE OF THE INFINITIVE

Scholars have hardly looked at the influence that the semantics of the infinitive might have on its tense; however, some of them did at least notice the high frequency of *dare* with future force. Moreover, Sjögren (1906: 63) also examined what effect the voice of the infinitive might have on its tense. According to him, the present infinitive passive very rarely has future meaning. If read in conjunction with Bennett's statement (1910: 426) that the 'use of the present infinitive with future force is somewhat common in Archaic Latin', one might get the impression that the voice of the infinitive has some influence on the choice of tense, and that the present infinitive passive is shunned in favour of the future form, which is the exact opposite of the situation in later Latin.<sup>23</sup> But Sjögren (1906: 57) also tells us that future passive infinitives occur only four times in Plautus and three times in Terence, which is quite rare as well. If we judge from these accounts, it is doubtful whether there is a causal connection between the voice of the infinitive and its tense.

Again, I have compiled statistics for AclIs after the above twenty verbs in Plautus and Terence. They are shown in Table 5.8.

<sup>22</sup> The infinitive is atelic only three times. One of the examples is *dixit sēsē operam prōmissam dare* (Asin. 366), 'he said he would devote his attention to it as promised.' Here the action is considered as a continuous process rather than as something with a clearly definable end. The other two examples, *Trin.* 5 and *Haut.* 501, also involve the idiom *operam dare/datūrum*. Outside this idiom, the verb does not have to be telic; iterative events like 'give books' are atelic. (This type seems to be rare.)

<sup>23</sup> Adams (1977: 51) notes the 'lack of currency of the future passive infinitive' in non-standard texts. In P. Mich. viii. 468. 36–8, edited by Youtie and Winter (1951), Terentianus writes *spērō mē frūgālīter [u]īcītūrum et in cohortem [trā]nsferri*, 'I hope that I shall live economically and that I am transferred to the cohort', i.e. he co-ordinates future active and present passive infinitives, both with future force.

TABLE 5.8. Voice and tense in AcIs

|                                     | Active | Passive | Total | Passive (%) |
|-------------------------------------|--------|---------|-------|-------------|
| Present infinitives, present force  | 648    | 76      | 724   | 10.50       |
| Future infinitives                  | 202    | 7       | 209   | 3.35        |
| Present infinitives, future meaning | 72     | 8       | 80    | 10          |
| Total                               | 922    | 91      | 1013  | 8.98        |

We can see that passive infinitives are always rare, regardless of their tense, and nowhere do they ever reach 11% of the total.<sup>24</sup> However, the future passive infinitive is disproportionately rare, and given that we have 209 future infinitives in total, this does not seem to be due to chance.<sup>25</sup> The present infinitive passive with future meaning appears to be preferred over its future tense counterpart. According to Leeman, Pinkster, and Wisse (1996: 313) this is especially the case in legal language; among their Plautine examples there is *prōdī spērāuit*, ‘he hoped that they would be thrust out’ (*Rud.* 589) and *spondēn...darī*, ‘do you guarantee...that it is given’ (*Trin.* 1162).<sup>26</sup> However, as Adams (1977: 51) showed, this old pattern also survives in non-standard texts.

## SUBJECT ACCUSATIVES

Another factor that might be relevant for which tense the infinitive gets is whether or not it is combined with a subject accusative. In Latin, a pronominal subject accusative is sometimes left out. This can happen both when the subject accusative would have the same reference as the main clause subject, as in *Most.* 633, and when the

<sup>24</sup> Passives are normally rarer than actives, especially in unplanned discourse, see Ochs (1979: 70). For Latin passives in general and for statistics see Pinkster (1985b).

<sup>25</sup> The likelihood that this finding is statistically significant is, in fact, higher than 99.95%, as can be demonstrated by a t-test.

<sup>26</sup> For the phrase *darī spondēs* see Gaius *inst.* 3. 93; it is technical and neither archaic nor colloquial. For further examples of present passive infinitives with future force in legal language see Kalb (1888: 43–6).

two subjects are different, for example in *Mil.* 231.<sup>27</sup> H–S 362, K–St i. 700–1, and Landgraf (1914: 129) agree that this is a colloquialism, but add that the phenomenon is not restricted to certain writers, genres, or periods, which contradicts their statement about register. Adams (1972: 370) shows that the ellipsis of subject accusatives is more frequent in Tacitus' *Annals* than in his *Histories*, which could indicate that Tacitus considered it an archaism.

Lindsay (1907: 73) does not make remarks about register, but states that the subject accusative 'is often, especially with Pres. Inf., left unexpressed ...'. As an example of the optionality of the subject accusative with a present infinitive having future meaning he cites a passage from *Curc.*:

(20) (Palinurus deliberately misunderstands Phaedromus.)

*Phaedromus*: *Me īferre Venerī uōuī iāientāculum.*

*Palinurus*: *Quid? Te antepōnēs Venerī iāientāculō? (Curc. 72–3.)*

*Phaedromus*: I vowed I *would* offer a breakfast to Venus. *Palinurus*: What? You *will give yourself* as breakfast to Venus?

Phaedromus uses *mē* as the subject accusative of *īferre*, on which the object *iāientāculum* depends. But Palinurus' question shows that he parses Phaedromus' words differently: *uōuī* selects the infinitive *īferre*, which does not have a subject accusative. *Mē* is regarded as the object of *īferre*, and *iāientāculum* as a *praedicātīuum* modifying it.

This is a good example of the present infinitive having future meaning, but not of the general optionality of the subject accusative: according to K–St i. 701, a pronominal subject accusative is regularly left unexpressed, even in Classical Latin, if otherwise the same form of the pronoun were to occur twice. If Phaedromus had intended to say what Palinurus claims he is saying, and if he had used a subject accusative, *mē* would occur twice in the sentence.

Like Lindsay, Sjögren (1906: 57) also believes that the subject accusative is omitted more freely with a present infinitive referring to the future than with a future tense form proper. By contrast, K–St i. 701 argue that the tense and voice of the infinitive as well as the

<sup>27</sup> K–St i. 701 point out that this is a strong argument against the construction's being a Graecism.

**TABLE 5.9.** Presence and absence of pronominal subject accusatives in cantica and senarii

|                      | Cantica | Senarii | Total | Tokens in cantica (%) |
|----------------------|---------|---------|-------|-----------------------|
| With subject acc.    | 371     | 221     | 592   | 62.67                 |
| Without subject acc. | 85      | 53      | 138   | 61.59                 |

*Note:* Pronouns can be left out because they are ‘unemphatic’. But the nominal acc. (like *rem*) is very often also ‘unemphatic’ and comes close to some pronouns in this respect. And there are of course ‘emphatic’ pronouns, like *illum* in *Andr.* 564, which is contrastive. I counted forms of *hic*, *iste*, *ille*, and *is* as pronominal, but nothing else. *Ipse* and the like cannot normally be left out because they are contrastive or important for other reasons.

semantics of the superordinate verb do not have any influence on the presence or absence of the subject accusative.<sup>28</sup>

There are thus two major questions concerning subject accusatives: first, is the lack of the subject accusative a colloquialism? And second, is it influenced by the tense of the infinitive?

With regard to the alleged colloquial character of AcIs without subject accusatives, I shall look at the twenty superordinate verbs and the distribution over Plautine cantica and senarii, although of course distribution patterns alone do not establish much. Forms and constructions that are unmarked for high register ought to have a distribution pattern of 3 : 1 over cantica and senarii.<sup>29</sup> The relevant data can be seen in Table 5.9, in which I added up present infinitives with present force, future infinitives, and present infinitives with future meaning.

The distribution over cantica and senarii is very similar for AcIs with and without subject accusatives. In both cases, there are fewer AcIs in cantica than the 75% which might be expected, but the ratios are more or less the same. This does not point to colloquial connotations for AcIs without subject accusatives.

Are there other criteria that speak for a colloquialism? In Ex. 21 the subject accusative of the AcI is omitted even though the passage as a whole is in an elevated style:

<sup>28</sup> Adams (1972: 371) notes that Tacitus in his *Histories* omits *sē* more often with the future tense than with other tenses, a finding which is similar to my results for Plautus and Terence below; in the *Annals*, however, the reflexive pronoun is omitted freely with other tenses as well.

<sup>29</sup> See Ch. 1 for this way of discovering register differences.

(21) (Tyndarus knows that he will be punished for saving his former master.)

Quī per uirtūtem periit, at nōn interit. ...

Pol si istuc faxis, hau sine poenā fēceris,

si ille hūc rebītēt, sicut cōfido affore. (*Capt.* 690 + 695–6.)

He who has died on account of his virtue does not perish. ... By Pollux, if you do this, you shall not have done so without punishment if my master comes back, as I *trust* he *will be back*.

Here Tyndarus presents himself as a faithful servant who is willing to suffer for his master. Lindsay (1900: 273) remarks that the scene ‘offers the strongest possible contrast to the bustling comedy of the last. The verse now becomes the Iambic Senarius, of a type far more free from resolved syllables than the ordinary Senarius of Comedy. In fact the metre, as well as the language, of a great part of the scene has more of the tragic than the comic style.’ The serious content of the passage is neatly reflected in the elevated language: there are frequent alliterations, for example *in patriam ad patrem* in l. 686 (with an etymological figure) or *potius... periculō praeoptāuisse... periret pōnere* in ll. 687–8; the verb *cluēre* in l. 689 is also typical of tragedy and epic, and within comedy mostly occurs in parodies of tragedy; and the phrase *mortī mīserō* in l. 692 is reminiscent of Virgil’s *dēmīsere necī* in *Aen.* 2. 85. What is more, Tyndarus’ words above contain a threat, and threats are often quite formal because they are phrased in language that is close to the legal idiom.

Not many passages containing Acls without subject accusatives clearly belong to a higher register, but at the same time the construction is not more frequent in other registers either. On the whole it seems to be stylistically neutral.

The above observations as well as the fact that Acls without subject accusatives occur in all writers, genres, and periods should make us regard this as ‘une construction vraiment latine et non pas une incorrection ou un hellénisme’ (Lebreton 1901: 378). Statements to the contrary cannot be upheld. Those who speak of a colloquialism oversimplify matters because they regard schoolbook Latin as ‘the norm’ and consider any deviations as wrong or at least substandard.

I shall now turn to tense. Table 5.10 shows that the omission of the subject accusative is indeed more frequent with some tenses than with others in Plautus and Terence.

**TABLE 5.10.** Subject accusatives and tenses

|   | With pronominal<br>subject acc. | Without<br>subject acc. | Total | Without<br>subject acc. (%) |
|---|---------------------------------|-------------------------|-------|-----------------------------|
| Present infinitives, present<br>meaning | 396                             | 100                     | 496   | 20.16                       |
| Future infinitives                      | 103                             | 51                      | 154   | 33.12                       |
| Present infinitives, future<br>force    | 34                              | 36                      | 70    | 51.43                       |

Omission of the subject accusative is quite rare if the infinitive belongs to the present tense and has present meaning; on average, it occurs in around 20% of the cases. If the AclIs have future tense infinitives, absence of the accusative is more frequent in Plautus and Terence and can be seen in roughly 33% of the tokens. Omission of the subject accusative is even more frequent among present tense infinitives having future meaning: in Plautus and Terence together, it can be observed in about 51% of the instances.<sup>30</sup>

At first sight, such a pattern must strike us as odd. However, it can be explained relatively easily. Pronominal subject accusatives can be left unexpressed if the addressee can be expected to understand nevertheless what the subject of the infinitive is. Above, I noted a clear difference between the present infinitives with future force on the one hand, and the future infinitives and the present infinitives with present meaning on the other. If the infinitive has present tense, but future reference, it is highly likely that its subject and the subject of the superordinate verb are the same; we saw that this is the case in 77.5% of the tokens. This is not true of future infinitives and present infinitives with present force. Thus if there is a present infinitive with future force, the addressee can usually guess the subject; it will most often be the same as that of the superordinate verb. This explains why subject accusatives are so often missing among the present infinitives with future force. Moreover, it can be assumed that the expression of subject accusatives was originally optional and that the old present infinitives with future force have preserved this pattern particularly well. However, the discrepancies between present infinitives with

<sup>30</sup> The likelihood that these findings are statistically significant is between 99.5% and 99.95%, as can be seen from a t-test.

present meaning and future infinitives cannot be explained in either of these ways. In both cases there are more infinitives whose subjects are not identical with those of the superordinate verbs than there are infinitives whose subjects are identical. This makes guessing an unexpressed subject more difficult. Why, then, is the subject accusative more frequently missing if the infinitive has future tense? The answer seems to lie in the infinitives themselves: present infinitives are inflected for active and passive, but nothing else. Future active infinitives, on the other hand, normally agree with their subject accusatives in number and gender. Therefore, even if the subject accusative is left out, it can easily be retrieved because of the verb.<sup>31</sup> Similarly, the subject accusative is more easily omitted with the perfect passive than with the perfect active infinitive because the perfect passive infinitive contains a participle coding the gender and number of the missing constituent.<sup>32</sup>

## REGISTER DIFFERENCES

I have just stated that the lack of subject accusatives does not seem to be a colloquialism. But there might still be some relevant register differences. The present infinitive with future reference is frequent in Plautus and Terence, but rare in Classical Latin. For this reason, K–St i. 690 claim that the present infinitive instead of the future form is a colloquialism. H–S 357–8, on the other hand, do not speak of lower register and say that this tense usage after verbs of speech and after *spērāre* ‘to hope’ occurs ‘without obvious reason’ (*ohne ersichtlichen Grund*) in Archaic Latin, often seems to be due to metrical considerations and recurs with even greater freedom in Late Latin.

<sup>31</sup> The archaic pattern whereby the future infinitive does not agree with its subject acc. is already very rare in Plautus, although of course the manuscript tradition may have obliterated some instances where this was the case. For non-agreement cf. *Cas.* 670–1, where *Casina* is the subject of the infinitive: *dēierāuit occīsūrū* (instead of *occīsūram*). For this type of future active infinitive in general see Gell. 1. 7. 6–8. The combination of such uninflected future infinitives with *esse* is a contamination of a living and a dying construction; note *rem publicam peruentūrū esse* in Sulla *hist.* 20 and *omnia . . . prōcessūrū esse* in Val. Ant. *hist.* 59.

<sup>32</sup> See de Melo (2006).

Are K–St i. 690 right in calling the use of the present tense infinitive with future meaning a colloquialism? Frequently, lexical items and collocations that are common in Archaic and Late Latin cannot be found in the classical language. This often points to sub-literary survival during the classical period rather than learned revival from literary sources in Late Latin, especially if the words in question are continued in the Romance languages. But matters are more complicated when it comes to syntactic constructions. Concerning the use of the present infinitive instead of the future tense, it is easy to imagine that its rarity in Classical Latin is indeed the result of its colloquial character. Yet it could equally well be true that the future infinitive was still spreading in Archaic Latin, while in Late Latin this form was dying out again.<sup>33</sup> Under these circumstances it would at least be possible that the future infinitive and the present form with future force do not differ in register in Archaic Latin.

Another question that comes to mind is whether the present infinitive with future meaning is connected with the present indicative with future meaning. Such a connection does not necessarily exist because the present indicative *pōnō* replaces a future of the same stem, *pōnam*, while the present infinitive *pōnere* substitutes for a future form belonging to a different stem, *positūrum* (*esse*). H–S do not seem to believe in a connection between the present indicative and the present infinitive instead of the respective future forms; they describe the present indicative as colloquial and point out that it is for example particularly frequent in the speech of Petronius' freedmen (307–8), but they claim that there is no rationale behind the variation between future infinitives and present infinitives with future meaning (357–8). Whatever connotations the present indicative instead of the future has in Classical Latin, it seems that in Archaic Latin the variation between present indicative with future meaning and future tense proper is more likely to be determined by lexical factors and collocations, as Sjögren (1906: 71) argues; after *quam mox* 'how soon', for instance, one only finds the present tense, but never the future. For

<sup>33</sup> Apart from pure Latinisms such as *futuro*, there are no traces of forms in *-tūrus* in the Romance languages, and some Late Latin writers hardly ever use them, see H–S 390.

TABLE 5.11. AclS in Plautus: cantica and senarii

|                                      | Cantica | Senarii | Total | Cantica (%) |
|--------------------------------------|---------|---------|-------|-------------|
| Present infinitives, present meaning | 332     | 193     | 525   | 63.24       |
| Future infinitives                   | 81      | 61      | 142   | 57.04       |
| Present infinitives, future force    | 42      | 21      | 63    | 66.67       |
| Total                                | 455     | 275     | 730   | 62.33       |

these reasons, I shall not draw on the register of such indicatives when I am discussing the infinitives.

Following Haffter's (1934) and Happ's (1967) results, I expect stylistically unmarked forms to have a distribution pattern of 3:1 over Plautine cantica and senarii. Table 5.11 shows the distribution of present infinitives with present meaning, future infinitives, and present infinitives with future force in Plautus after the twenty verbs listed earlier.

There are some unexpected results: of the 730 infinitives in total, 455, that is 62.33%, are in cantica. I should have expected more, around 75%. It is unclear how this discrepancy can be explained. Whatever the correct answer may be, it is noticeable that the three subgroups, present tense with present meaning, future tense, and present tense with future force, are more or less distributed in the same way. If anything, the present infinitive with future meaning is more frequent in cantica than the future infinitive, but here the figures are low. At any rate, at least the distribution of forms does not point to colloquial connotations for the present infinitive with future reference: colloquial forms should be rarer in cantica.

What is more interesting than the distribution over cantica and senarii in comedy is the question whether the present infinitive with future force occurs in tragedy as well as in comedy. Absence from tragedy is a stronger indicator of colloquial connotations than the distribution over different verse types in comedy. In the extant fragments of tragedy and epic, AclS with future reference are relatively rare, but a few instances of present infinitives with future meaning can nevertheless be found. In Trag. inc. 13–14 + 16 one reads *uōce diuīna ēdidit Apollō . . . eum esse exitium Troiae, pestem Pergamō*, 'with divine voice Apollo announced that he (sc. Paris) would be a ruin for Troy

and a plague for Pergamum'; and in Enn. *ann.* 133 there is *annūit sēsē mēcum dēcernere ferrō*, 'he agreed that he would fight with me with the sword for a decision.' It is not clear whether Pacuu. *trag.* 167 is relevant here: *prius data est quam tibi darī dicta*, 'she was given to you before it was said that she would be given to you.' The construction is a nominative with infinitive rather than an accusative with infinitive, and the infinitive itself is *darī*; because the present infinitive *dare* is so frequent in AcIs with future meaning, register differences need not matter for the choice of tenses.

The usage in comedy does not speak for a colloquialism either: a closer look at the forms reveals that both future infinitives and present infinitives with future meaning are found in passages with low as well as high register. Ex. 22 is a sample of stylistically neutral<sup>34</sup> language:

(22) (Menaechmus tells Erotium's servant that he will comply with whatever her mistress asks him to do.)

*Menaechmus*: Et istuc et aliud sī quid cūrārī uolēt

*mē cūrātūrum dicitō*, quicquid uolēt. . .

*Servant*: Dīcam cūrāre? *Menaechmus*: Dicitō: cūrābitur. (*Men.* 528–9 + 538.)

*Menaechmus*: Tell her that I shall take care (future infinitive) of this and anything else she wants to be taken care of, whatever she may want. . . *Servant*: Can I tell her that you take care (present infinitive) of it? *Menaechmus*: Tell her: 'it shall be seen to.'

Both *cūrātūrum* and *cūrāre* have future reference. It is impossible to detect a difference in register. The passage is part of a typical dialogue in senarii. The vast majority of the passages with relevant AcIs seem to be in such neutral language. In Ex. 23, by contrast, the register is probably high (cf. Ex. 20 above):

(23) (Phaedromus has made a vow.)

*Me īferre Venerī uōuī iāientāculum.* (*Curc.* 72.)

I vowed that I would offer a breakfast to Venus.

It is unlikely that the present tense infinitive *īferre* has a lower register. Throughout this introductory scene, Phaedromus uses stilted expressions such as *apiculārum operā congestum* (l. 10) for 'candle'

<sup>34</sup> I use the term 'neutral' to refer to forms and constructions that are shared by many different writers and genres; see Adams and Mayer (1999b: 3).

or Greek-style compounds like *multibiba atque merobiba* 'a heavy drinker of pure wine'. A colloquialism would be inappropriate in such a passage.

Consequently there is no convincing evidence that the present tense infinitive with future force is colloquial in Archaic Latin. The present indicative with future force cannot be used to argue for colloquial connotations either, because unlike the present infinitive it replaces a form of the same stem and because it is employed under different circumstances, mainly with some verbs of movement and in dialogue rather than soliloquy (Sjögren 1906: 71). Any statements to the effect that the present infinitive with future meaning is colloquial in Archaic Latin seem to come not from descriptive, but rather from prescriptive grammar. In the classical period and later on, however, the present infinitive with future meaning survived mainly as an archaism (for legal texts see Kalb 1888: 43–6) or as a feature of non-literary language (for non-standard texts see Adams 1977: 51).

## THE INFLUENCE OF THE GOVERNING VERB

Most scholars agree that the semantics of the governing verb has some influence on whether an AcI with future meaning contains a present or a future infinitive. But are they right? Bennett (1910: 426), who is most explicit, states that the present tense infinitive with future meaning is common 'especially with verbs whose meaning involves a reference to future time, as verbs of hoping, promising, swearing, vowing, threatening, etc.' H-S 357–8 and Sjögren (1906: 57–8) do not offer an explanation why some verbs should be more prone than others to take present infinitives with future meaning, but claim that such infinitives can be found most frequently after verbs of saying and *spērāre* 'to hope', while after *cēnsēre* 'to suppose', *crēdere* 'to deem', *putāre* 'to believe', and *scīre* 'to know' this usage is rare. Such a statement can, but need not be interpreted along Bennett's lines: the more likely AcIs after certain verbs are to refer to the future, the more redundant the future tense is, and the more frequently the present tense infinitive can be used with future meaning.

But do these ideas tally with the facts? The superordinate verbs I am looking at differ quite considerably in their semantics: when *dicere* 'to say' takes the AcI, this AcI refers to a statement or report; by contrast, AcIs dependent on *cōnfidere* 'to trust, expect' mostly refer to mental states, to wishes and aspirations. Statements can equally well be made about the past, the present, and the future, while expectations are more likely to concern the future than the present or the past. This is confirmed by my data: in Plautus and Terence, there are 247 AcIs with future or present infinitives that depend on *dicere*, and there are 17 such AcIs that depend on *cōnfidere*; of the 247 tokens dependent on *dicere*, 164, that is 66.40%, select present infinitives referring to the present, while of the 17 tokens dependent on *cōnfidere*, not a single one has an infinitive with present reference. If I accepted Bennett's hypothesis, I might now put forward a theory like the following: since only one-third of the AcIs after *dicō* refer to the future, the future tense is important to distinguish between AcIs with present reference and those with future reference. But as all AcIs after *cōnfidō* have future meaning, the future tense is redundant. Consequently *dicō* should in proportion have fewer AcIs with present infinitives and future meaning than *cōnfidō*. However, this hypothesis turns out to be false. All 17 AcIs after *cōnfidō* contain future infinitives, while *dicō* takes the present infinitive with future force quite freely, in 26 out of 83 cases where the AcI has future reference.

If I can generalize from these findings, it seems that Bennett's idea was wrong: if the meaning of a verb implies that its complement has future reference, it does not follow that it is more likely to contain a present tense infinitive with future force. Nevertheless, the semantics of the governing verb might still have some influence, but along the lines found in H-S and Sjögren: the present infinitive with future force might be more easily permitted after *uerba dicendī* and *spērāre* than after *uerba sentiendī* like *crēdere* or *cōnfidere*.

Is this correct? I shall divide the relevant verbs into two groups. On the one hand, there is group 1, containing *spērō* and the following *uerba dicendī*: *adiūrō*, *aiō*, *autumō*, *dēnegō*, *dicō*, *interminor*, *iūrō/iūs iūrandum dō*, *minor*, *negō*, *polliceor*, *prōmittō*, *reprōmittō*, and *uoueō*. And on the other hand, there is group 2 with the following *uerba sentiendī* uel *affectūs*: *arbitror*, *audiō*, *cēseō*, *cōnfidō*, *crēdō*, and *sciō*.

TABLE 5.12. AcIs with future meaning: the two groups

|         | Future<br>infinitives | Present infinitives,<br>future meaning | Total | Present infinitives,<br>future meaning (%) |
|---------|-----------------------|--|-------|--|
| Group 1 | 116                   | 75                                     | 191   | 39.27                                      |
| Group 2 | 93                    | 5                                      | 98    | 5.10                                       |

TABLE 5.13. A classification of AcIs with future reference: the two groups

|         | Atelic | Telic, different<br>subject | Telic, same<br>subject | Total | Telic + different<br>subject (%) | Telic + same<br>subject (%) |
|---------|--------|-----------------------------|------------------------|-------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Group 1 | 43     | 42                          | 106                    | 191   | 21.99                            | 55.50                       |
| Group 2 | 61     | 32                          | 5                      | 98    | 32.65                            | 5.10                        |

Table 5.12 shows that these verbs really do behave in the way suggested by H-S and Sjögren.

The present infinitive with future force is much more common with verbs of the first group than with those of the second. H-S and Sjögren seem to be justified. But it is hard to see why *uerba dicendī* should behave differently from *uerba sentiendī*. Could this preference which verbs of group 1 have for present infinitives with future force be a mere symptom of something else?

I argued above that the present infinitive with future force cannot be used indiscriminately under all circumstances. It is basically restricted to telic AcIs, and here it is only really frequent if the subject of the AcI is the same as that of the superordinate verb. Table 5.13 classifies the AcIs with future reference found in the two groups (future and present tense).

H-S and Sjögren have only described symptoms, but not the underlying causes. The semantics of the verbs in group 2 is not *per se* the reason why the AcIs with future reference do not normally have present infinitives here; it is only the reason why most of the selected AcIs are atelic, or telic in combination with a different subject. It is, in turn, the rarity of telic AcIs with the same subject that is responsible for the low number of AcIs with present tense, but future reference.

**TABLE 5.14.** The diachronic decline of the present infinitive with future meaning

|         | Future<br>infinitives | Present infinitives,<br>future meaning | Total | Present infinitives,<br>future meaning (%) |
|---------|-----------------------|--|-------|--|
| Plautus | 76                    | 63                                     | 139   | 45.32                                      |
| Terence | 35                    | 17                                     | 52    | 32.69                                      |

## DIACHRONIC DIFFERENCES

Differences in usage between Plautus and Terence can be explained in several ways. As both writers have the same subject matter, most phenomena found in only one of them are due to different stylistic preferences or diachronic changes, and often it is difficult to decide between these two possibilities. If I am correct in saying that the present infinitive with future force is not a colloquialism or otherwise marked for register, differences in tense between the two authors are unlikely to be mere differences of style between the more colloquial Plautus and the more formal Terence. If under these circumstances Plautus uses the present infinitive with future meaning more frequently than the future infinitive, while the opposite is true of Terence, it is probable that this is the result of diachronic change.

Neither Lindsay (1907) nor Allardice (1929) makes any remarks on such diachronic differences between Plautus and Terence because each of them deals with only one author. K–St do not contain the relevant information either, but H–S 358 have some statistics based on Leopold (1904: 33) and Sjögren (1906: 57).<sup>35</sup> However, these authors count all future infinitives and all present infinitives with future force. But since the use of the present instead of the future infinitive is more or less restricted to telic ACIs, they are not comparing like with like. In order to see if there is a diachronic decline between Plautus and Terence, I only count telic future infinitives, but I also include the few atelic present infinitives with future reference (Table 5.14).

As will be seen, there is a real decline of the present infinitive with future force between Plautus and Terence. Among the telic events,

<sup>35</sup> Leopold's dissertation contains the future infinitives, but not the present infinitives with future meaning, the data for which can be found in Sjögren.

Plautus uses it in around 45% of the cases, while Terence employs it in only about 33% of all tokens.<sup>36</sup>

## CONCLUSIONS

This was the last chapter discussing the usage of regular verb forms. Like the preceding ones, it was not an end in itself. Rather, the findings here will be relevant for the discussion of sigmatic infinitives in Ch. 8. Sigmatic infinitives occur mainly in AcIs with future reference. In this type of context, present infinitives and future infinitives can be found as well. This naturally raises the question whether the AcIs with sigmatic forms are closer to the AcIs with present infinitives or to those with future forms. But in order to answer this question, one has to know if the alternation between present and future infinitives is random or if there is a rationale behind it. This is the problem I addressed in this chapter. I examined in detail eight factors that might influence this choice. The two of them that turned out to be crucial had not been discussed by other scholars.

I found that the present infinitive can be used with future reference only if the AcI is telic. The reason for this seems to be diachronic. Most AcIs referring to the present are atelic, while among the AcIs with future reference the telic ones predominate. Before the future infinitives were created, the present infinitives were used for both present and future reference. When the unambiguous future infinitives began to be employed instead of the present infinitives, they replaced the atelic present infinitives with future meaning first. Since most atelic infinitives have present force, atelic present infinitives with future reference would be likely to be misinterpreted as having present reference. What is more, the distinction between simultaneity and posteriority is easier to draw among atelic events than among telic ones.

The second restriction is not an absolute one: the present infinitive with future force is far more likely to be used if it has the same subject

<sup>36</sup> The likelihood that this finding is statistically significant is between 90% and 95%, as can be seen from a t-test.

as the superordinate verb than if there is a difference in subjects. There seem to be two explanations. First, if there is identity of subjects between superordinate verb and AcI, the two events are more closely linked than is the case otherwise, and cross-linguistically such a close connection tends to be associated with fewer tense choices. And second, at least in my limited corpus, people are more likely to refer to future time when talking about themselves than when talking about other people or things. Thus the present infinitive with future reference is more likely to be misinterpreted as having present reference if there is a difference of subjects than if there is identity of subjects. This is why the present infinitive with future meaning was preserved better if the subjects of the infinitive and of the superordinate verb are the same.

Sjögren's statement (1906: 57, 59) that *dare* is particularly frequent among the present infinitives with future force is correct. There are two reasons for this: first, forms of *dare* with future meaning are virtually always telic, and second, *dare* is a frequent verb and could therefore retain the old pattern better.

As H-S 358 rightly observed, there is a decline of the present infinitive with future meaning between Plautus and Terence.

This leaves me with four factors. I hope to have shown that register does not determine the choice of tenses in AcIs in Plautus and Terence. Voice matters to some extent: the present with future force is more frequent in the passive. What is more, the present with future force is particularly frequent after *spērāre* and verbs of speech, but rare after *uerba sentiendī* like *scīre*. However, the underlying reason for this has nothing to do with the superordinate verbs as such, but rather with the fact that *uerba dīcendī* are more often combined with telic AcIs than *uerba sentiendī*. Moreover, the subjects of the infinitives and the superordinate verbs are very often the same for *uerba dīcendī*, but not for *uerba sentiendī*. The last factor concerns an observation made by Lindsay (1907: 73), which, however, he could not explain: he pointed out that the subject accusative is very often omitted in the case of present infinitives with future force. It seems to me that it is not the absence of subject accusatives that causes the use of the present instead of the future, but that it is the other way round: among the present infinitives with future force, the subjects of the superordinate verbs and of the infinitives are the same in more than

three-quarters of the cases, so the subject accusatives can normally be inferred.

Finally, it is interesting to see how much of this usage has survived in Classical Latin. Menge, Burkard, and Schauer (2000: 687) cite four passages from Caesar and two from Cicero in which the present infinitives are used with future force (eight tokens altogether). These are exceptions which do not fit into their rule system, and so they claim that there is a semantic difference between future and present infinitive: the former is unmarked and has normal future reference, while the latter is used for immediate realization. When I look at these six passages,<sup>37</sup> I can interpret some of them in this way, but not all. In Ex. 24, there is the meaning of ‘instant realization’, but in Exx. 25 and 26 such an interpretation is impossible:

(24) (Caesar sends L. Minucius Basilus away, saying that he will follow shortly.)

Sēsē cōnfestim *supsequī* dicit. (Caes. *Gall.* 6. 29. 5.)

He says that he *follows* shortly.

(25) (The Ubii want to prove their innocence to Caesar.)

Sī amplius opsidum uelit, *darī* pollicentur. (Caes. *Gall.* 6. 9. 7.)

They promise that, if he should want more hostages, they *are given*.<sup>38</sup>

(26) (Alfenus, Quinctius’ attorney, had appealed to the tribunes. As a result he does not have to give security that Quinctius will pay if he loses the case, but he has to promise that Quinctius will come.)

... ita tum discēditur ut Idibus Septembribus P. Quīntium *sistī* Sex. Alfēnus prōmitteret. (Cic. *Quinct.* 29.)

They then separated with this agreement, that Sex. Alfenus should promise that P. Quinctius *appears* in court on 13 September.

When I look at these three cases, I find the meaning of immediate realization in Ex. 24, but it could be the result of the adverb *cōnfestim*

<sup>37</sup> They are Caes. *Gall.* 2. 32. 3, 4. 21. 5 (two infinitives), 6. 9. 7 (Ex. 25), and 6. 29. 5 (Ex. 24), and Cic. *de orat.* 3. 95 (two infinitives) and *Quinct.* 29 (Ex. 26). Wilkins (1892: 459) wants to follow Pearce and correct *de orat.* 3. 95 to *dēspērem... ea... trādī ac perpolīrī* <*posse*>, but has no manuscript support for it.

<sup>38</sup> This is the interpretation of Menge, Burkard, and Schauer (2000: 687). However, *darī* could also depend on *uelit*, which is why Kraner, Dittenberger, Meusel, and Oppermann (1960) print *uelit darī, pollicentur*.

rather than of the present infinitive. In Ex. 25, the act of giving is contingent on Caesar's wishes and cannot possibly refer to anything immediate. If a speaker of Archaic Latin were to address a corresponding command to the Ubii, he would probably say *sī Caesar plūs opsidum uolēt, datōte*, with the future imperative showing non-immediacy or contingency. In Ex. 26, the date rules out the meaning of immediacy. Thus it seems more likely that we are dealing not with a semantic contrast, but with sporadic survivals from Archaic Latin that are particularly frequent in legal language.<sup>39</sup> This position is confirmed by three facts: six of the infinitives are telic,<sup>40</sup> four of the subject accusatives have the same reference as the subjects of the superordinate verbs,<sup>41</sup> and the infinitive is a form of *dare* in two instances.<sup>42</sup>

I shall now turn to the extra-paradigmatic forms themselves, first to the sigmatic indicatives, then to their subjunctive counterparts, and after that, in Ch. 8, to the sigmatic infinitives, for which this chapter was a prerequisite.

<sup>39</sup> For *sistī prōmīsīt* as a set phrase see Vlp. *dig.* 2. 6. 4, 2. 9. 1 *pr.*, and 2. 11. 2 *pr.* For *de orat.* 3. 95 and *Quinct.* 29 see also Leeman, Pinkster, and Wisse (1996: 313).

<sup>40</sup> The exceptions are *Caes. Gall.* 6. 29. 5 (*supsequī*) and 4. 21. 5, where *optemperāre* is, however, combined with telic *dare*.

<sup>41</sup> *Caes. Gall.* 2. 32. 3, 4. 21. 5 (two infinitives), and 6. 29. 5.

<sup>42</sup> *Caes. Gall.* 4. 21. 5. and 6. 9. 7

*This page intentionally left blank*

## Part II

# The Extra-Paradigmatic Verb Forms: A Synchronic Analysis

*This page intentionally left blank*

## Introduction to Part II

*'Faxō' enim 'faxis' dēfectīuum est.* (Eutyech. *gramm.* v. 485. 14.)  
For *faxō* lacks a form *faxis*.<sup>1</sup>

DESPITE Eutyches' claims, *faxis* does exist. It occurs eight times in Plautus and once in Terence. This shows that one cannot rely on the Roman grammarians for information about extra-paradigmatic forms and that one has to analyse the Archaic Latin texts themselves. This is what I shall be doing in this second part of the book.

In Part I of the book I examined how the regular forms function in Archaic Latin; I looked at future tenses, the sequence rules in subordinate clauses, prohibitive clauses, and the expression of futurity in Acl's. None of this was intended as an end in itself, but rather as a prerequisite for studying the meaning and use of the extra-paradigmatic forms. The rules and regularities I discovered will help in the analyses that follow.

The extra-paradigmatic futures will be discussed in Ch. 6. Here a comparison with regular futures will be important. But in order to see whether the extra-paradigmatic futures are closer to simple futures or future perfects, the contrast between these two regular futures needs to be clear. This contrast was the topic of Ch. 2.

Chs. 7, 9, and 10 deal with various types of extra-paradigmatic subjunctives. Such subjunctives occur in several clause types, many of which are subordinate. In a large proportion of the subordinate clauses in Classical Latin, tense usage is determined by the rules for

<sup>1</sup> The translation 'for *faxō faxis* is defective' is perhaps possible, but the position of *enim* makes it likely that *faxis* belongs with *dēfectīuum*, which takes the abl. without preposition several times in the grammarians.

the sequence of tenses. For Archaic Latin these rules are not clearly stated in the secondary literature. However, if such rules exist, they can be extremely useful for determining the tense and aspect of subjunctives in subordinate clauses. For this reason I examined the sequence of tenses in Archaic Latin in Ch. 3. A sizeable number of extra-paradigmatic subjunctives can also be found in prohibitive clauses. The two regular types they contrast with here are the perfect and present subjunctives. Again a comparison between regular and irregular types is instructive, but this requires that one understands the regular types. The use of prohibitive subjunctives in Archaic Latin was discussed in Ch. 4.

The extra-paradigmatic infinitives are the subject of Ch. 8. They are mainly used in ACIs with future reference, where they alternate with present and future infinitives. In order to see whether the extra-paradigmatic infinitives are closer to present or future infinitives, one has to know what determines the alternation between the regular forms. I looked at this topic in Ch. 5.

Morphologically, none of the irregular types belongs to the *infectum* or the *perfectum* stem. This raises the question whether they fit into this system syntactically or semantically, and if so, how.

But the problems do not end there. They are more or less the same for each type:

1. How productive are the formations?
2. What is their register?
3. What are their temporal and aspectual features?
4. Are they distributed equally over the clause types, or are there certain distributional peculiarities?

I shall begin with the sigmatic forms because they are the most conspicuous ones. I shall first look at the sigmatic futures (type *faxō/impetrāssō*, Ch. 6), then examine their subjunctive counterparts (type *faxim/impetrāssim*, Ch. 7), and finally turn to the sigmatic infinitives (type *impetrāssere*, Ch. 8). After this, I shall analyse the *ī*-subjunctives of the type *duim* (Ch. 9) and the *ā*-forms of the type *attigās* (Ch. 10).

## The Sigmatic Future in Archaic Latin

AMONG the extra-paradigmatic verb forms, the sigmatic type stands out because it has indicatives (*faxō, impetrāssō*) as well as subjunctives (*faxim, impetrāssim*), and even a few infinitives of the first conjugation (*impetrāssere*).<sup>1</sup> The indicatives especially are well-known from laws and Plautus. They are one of the hallmarks of Archaic Latin and legal language,<sup>2</sup> which is why Cicero employs them when he invents the laws of the ideal state in *leg.*<sup>3</sup> Similarly, Apuleius, whose taste for Plautine diction is well-known, uses the form *faxō* eight times. Thus it is fitting that I should begin my discussion of the extra-paradigmatic forms with the sigmatic indicatives.

The prototypical examples of sigmatic futures come from the Twelve Tables:

(1) *Sī nox fūrtum faxit, sī im occīsīt, iūre caesus estō.* (Lex XII tab. ap. Macr. *Sat.* 1. 4. 19.)

If he (*x*) *shall have committed* larceny at night, if he (*y*) *shall have killed* him, he (*x*) shall have been killed lawfully.<sup>4</sup>

(2) *Vtī lēgāssīt suae rei, ita iūs estō.* (Lex XII tab. ap. Gaius *inst.* 2. 224.)

As he *shall have made legacies* of his possessions, so it shall be sanctioned.

There is little doubt that the indicative forms mark some kind of future, but that is not sufficient. Five main questions arise:

<sup>1</sup> This chapter is largely based on de Melo (2002*b* and *c*).

<sup>2</sup> For legal style in general see Crawford (1996: i. 16–17).

<sup>3</sup> For Cicero's laws see Powell (2005) and Ch. 12.

<sup>4</sup> For such inexplicit changes of subject see Daube (1956: 57). For this law see Crawford (1996: ii. 612–13).

**TABLE 6.1.** Sigmatic futures in subordinate and main clauses in Plautus and Terence: tokens

|         | Subordinate clauses | Main clauses |
|---------|---------------------|--------------|
| Plautus | 53                  | 70           |
| Terence | 1                   | 9            |

1. Do they indicate tense or aspect?<sup>5</sup> In other words, do they relate an event to a temporal reference point or do they mark it as being a complete whole (perfectivity), beginning etc.?
2. Do they belong to a specific register or can they be used under any circumstances?
3. How productive are the formations?
4. Are the forms equally frequent in all clause types, and if not, why not?
5. Why do the sigmatic forms die out in the way they do?

A further question concerns their origin. I shall not treat the last question in detail, and the historical origins will be left aside until Ch. 11.

A look at the data reveals a surprising pattern of distribution: while many different verbs in all persons and numbers occur in subordinate clauses, the only form to be found in main clauses is *faxō*, the first person singular of *facere*.<sup>6</sup> Of course regular future perfects are also rare in main clauses, but the sigmatic future is the only category which is, with the exception of the frequent *faxō*, completely absent in main clauses. Tables 6.1 and 6.2 give the details.

Table 6.1 displays the number of tokens in subordinate and main clauses. We can see that there are more tokens in main clauses than in subordinate ones, especially in Terence. However, it has to be qualified by Table 6.2. There are twenty-nine different verbs in Plautus which have sigmatic indicative forms in subordinate clauses, but that there is only one verb which appears in main clauses in such a form. And it

<sup>5</sup> For a general discussion of tense and aspect in Latin see Chs. 2 and 3 as well as Pinkster (1983).

<sup>6</sup> The sigmatic subjunctives are not restricted in this way, see Ch. 7.

TABLE 6.2. Sigmatic futures in subordinate and main clauses in Plautus and Terence: types

|         | Subordinate clauses | Main clauses |
|---------|---------------------|--------------|
| Plautus | 29                  | 1            |
| Terence | 1                   | 1            |

must be added that the verbs in subordinate clauses occur in all persons and numbers, while the only form in main clauses is *faxō*. This pattern does not change if we look at the rest of Archaic Latin. There are thirty-four tokens.<sup>7</sup> One of them is *faxō* in a main clause, the other thirty-three are in conditional, temporal, and relative clauses. At first sight, this seems to contradict one of the above findings based on Plautus and Terence, namely that there are more tokens in main than in subordinate clauses. However, this is not necessarily the case. Nine of the tokens are citations from Archaic Latin literature. If we assume that main clause *faxō* was relatively common here, it was probably still understood by the grammarians and their contemporaries, and so there was no need to gloss it. The one instance of *faxō* in a main clause among these nine tokens is in Afran. *com.* 67. Non. p. 543. 23–4 cites the line not because of *faxō*, but because it contains the adjective *mītis*. The forms in subordinate clauses were rarer and more varied and hence more interesting for the grammarians. The other twenty-five tokens are in laws—hardly a sample of normal speech. They are typically in the form *sī/nī/quī faxit, ... estō*, that is, the main clauses regularly contain non-indicative directives (future imperatives or present subjunctives). In this connection compare Lex reg. ap. Fest. p. 190: *sī hominem fulminibus occīsīt, nē suprà genua tollitō*, ‘if he (Jupiter) has smashed a man with thunderbolts, one must not lift him above one’s knees.’<sup>8</sup> Obviously, texts like these do not allow main clause *faxō*.

Because of this distributional pattern it is essential to look at the semantics, register, and productivity of the forms in subordinate and

<sup>7</sup> I leave out *faxit* in the treaty between Rome and Callatis because the syntactic context is not entirely clear; the passage is in Warmington (1940: 292 + 294).

<sup>8</sup> ‘Lifting the corpse above one’s knees’ would mean ‘carrying the corpse away’, see Latte (1932: 270–1).

main clauses separately (first two sections).<sup>9</sup> After this I shall attempt to explain this unusual distribution. Finally, I shall summarize my findings and try to find a reason why the forms die out in the way they do.

## THE SIGMATIC FORMS IN SUBORDINATE CLAUSES

The vast majority of sigmatic indicative forms in subordinate clauses occur in conditional clauses; there are forty-eight in Plautus, one in Terence, and twenty-three elsewhere in Archaic Latin.<sup>10</sup> Only a few forms are found in relative clauses: there are two in Plautus and nine outside Plautus and Terence.<sup>11</sup> In temporal clauses, there are three in Plautus and one in Pacuu. *trag.* 325.

As we have seen, it is generally acknowledged that these forms have future reference, but that in itself does not tell us much about their semantics. However, the sigmatic futures in subordinate clauses are often co-ordinated with future perfects:

(3) (Euclio is threatening his servant.)

Si hercle tu ex istōc locō  
digitum trānsuorsum aut unguem lātum *excesseris*  
aut sī *respexis*, dōnicum ego tē iusserō,  
continuo hercle ego tē dēdam discipulam crucī. (*Aul.* 56–9.)

By Hercules, if you *shall have gone* a finger's or a nail's breadth from your place, or if you *shall have looked back* until I've told you, I shall, by Hercules, immediately put you on the cross for a lesson.

<sup>9</sup> Bertocci (2001), who also discusses the sigmatic futures, fails to recognize this pattern, which leads to some erroneous interpretations.

<sup>10</sup> Lex reg. ap. Fest. pp. 190, 260, Paul. Fest. p. 5; Lex XII tab. ap. Macr. *Sat.* 1. 4. 19 (two tokens), Fest. pp. 496, 508, Vlp. *dig.* 9. 4. 2. 1 (two tokens); Lex Sil. ap. Fest. p. 288, two tokens; Lex Aquilia ap. Vlp. *dig.* 9. 2. 27. 5; fr. legis ap. Gell. 20. 1. 12; Lex luci Lucr. (*CIL* i<sup>2</sup>. 401) 4; Lex luci Spolet. (*CIL* i<sup>2</sup>. 366) 2. 1 and 2. 4; *CIL* i<sup>2</sup>. 2872, ii. 4 and 7; Lex agr. (*CIL* i<sup>2</sup>. 585) 25; Enn. *ann.* 335; Acc. *trag.* 454 and 293; *dēuōtiō* in Macr. *Sat.* 3. 9. 11.

<sup>11</sup> Lex XII tab. ap. Gaius *inst.* 2. 224, Fest. p. 176, Plin. *nat.* 28. 18 (two tokens); Lex agr. (*CIL* i<sup>2</sup>. 585) 25 and 71; Cato *agr.* 14. 1; *dēuōtiō* in Macr. *Sat.* 3. 9. 11 (two tokens).

The clause with the future perfect *excesseris* is co-ordinated with the clause containing the sigmatic future *respexis*. It is unlikely that *respexis* has a temporal reference different from that of *excesseris*, since it merely introduces a more specific condition, not a new one. Similar co-ordination of sigmatic future and future perfect in conditional clauses can also be found in *Bacch.* 847–9, *Cas.* 1001–3, and *Rud.* 775–6. Compare also:

(4) (The speaker is in a catch-22 situation.)

*Peribō sī nōn fēcerō; sī faxō, uāpulābō.* (Plaut. *Fretum.*)

*I shall perish if I shall not have done it; if I shall have done it, I shall be beaten up.*

Here the two conditional and main clauses are not co-ordinated, but parallel to each other and have the same time reference; the future perfect or sigmatic future stands in the conditional clauses, and the simple future in the main clauses. Other instances of parallelism in conditional or relative clauses can be seen in *Capt.* 122 + 124, *Cas.* 1015–18, *Mil.* 156–7 + 163, and *Pseud.* 531–4.<sup>12</sup>

These instances of co-ordination and parallelism seem to indicate that the sigmatic futures have the same temporal reference as the future perfects in subordinate clauses. I have discussed the semantics of the future perfect in Ch. 2. Future perfects are used to show that the event in the subordinate clause is over before the one in the main clause begins. Consequently the sigmatic futures are also likely to indicate anteriority. Just like the future perfects, they can all be interpreted as perfective,<sup>13</sup> but unlike them, they are restricted to telic verbs, that is, verbs which imply the existence of an endpoint of an action.<sup>14</sup> This restriction may not be relevant for the synchronic

<sup>12</sup> There are also two instances of co-ordination with and parallelism to rhotacized forms: *sī... adiūuerō cūramue leuāssō* (Enn. *ann.* 335) and *sī... uerberit, ast... plōrāssit* (Lex reg. ap. Fest. p. 260). These rhotacized forms will be discussed at the end of Ch. 7. In Lex XII tab. ap. Fest. p. 496 there is parallelism between a sigmatic and a present form: *sī membrum rūpsit* (or *rūpit?*), *nī cum eō pacit, tāliō estō*.

<sup>13</sup> Under perfectivity I understand that an event is described as a whole, not as being in progress and incomplete.

<sup>14</sup> In *Cas.* 1001 *amāre* seems to mean ‘make love’ rather than static, atelic ‘love’, ‘be in love’: *si umquam posthāc aut amāssō Casinam aut occepsō modo* should be translated ‘if after this I shall ever have made love to Casina or if I shall merely have begun to do so.’ This restriction does not seem to apply to the sigmatic subjunctives, which can

semantics, but it could point to an aoristic origin of the sigmatic forms.

While it is true that we expect the protases of most conditional clauses to refer to events anterior to those mentioned in the apodoses (and similar considerations may be made for other subordinate clauses), the anteriority of the sigmatic forms does not necessarily depend on the subordinate clauses to which they belong. We can also find conditional clauses which do not express anteriority to main clauses, and in Ch. 2 I argued that in such cases it is the simple future that is used in the protases:

(5) (Epidicus is proposing a plan.)

Immō sī placēbit, ūtitōr,  
cōnsilium sī nōn placēbit, reperītōte rēctius. (*Epid.* 263–4.)

Well, if you *shall like* it, use it; if you *shall not like* the plan, find a more suitable one.

In Ex. 5 the addressees must still like the plan when the main clause action begins.

In other words, the co-ordination of sigmatic forms and future perfects is significant. We may see whether an anterior meaning is suggested or contradicted by other evidence. Unfortunately, the temporal adverbials are not very helpful. *Posthāc* (*Cas.* 1001) merely situates an action in the future, and *praeterhāc* (*Men.* 112, *Rud.* 1117, *Stich.* 345) need not even be taken as temporal because it can have a discourse function as well. *Ante* (*Asin.* 818) and *prius* (...*quam*,<sup>15</sup> *Epid.* 122–3) suggest anteriority, even if they themselves are not sufficient to prove it. Yet none of the occurrences of the sigmatic indicatives points in other directions, and we must conclude that these forms mark future anteriority.

If this is so, how do the sigmatic futures differ in usage from the future perfects? Conceivably, the distinction is not one of meaning, but of register. In order to see if this is possible, we ought to check how the forms are distributed over *cantica* and *senarii* in Plautus, on

be static, as in *ne is hercle ab istā nōn pedem discēdāt sī licēsīt* (*Asin.* 603) ‘really, he wouldn’t go one foot away from her if it were allowed.’

<sup>15</sup> *Hodiē* in the same passage may be temporal or may express anger, see Don. *Ter. Ad.* 660.

whom we shall concentrate for the moment, even though this in itself is insufficient.<sup>16</sup> Plautine cantica contain more elements of elevated language than the senarii. Put differently, the higher style in cantica is marked by the addition of special figures of speech or moribund forms. The use of archaic forms (like the sigmatic futures) is, however, not obligatory, as is for instance proved by the occurrence of sigmatic future forms which are co-ordinated with 'regular' future perfects. The ratio of cantica to senarii is 3 : 1, and stylistically unmarked forms should have a corresponding distribution. The two tokens in relative clauses are in cantica, and of the three tokens in temporal clauses the one that is not in a canticum is in a parody of a law (*Persa* 70), where higher register is appropriate.

At first sight, the situation seems to be different in conditional clauses: of the forty-eight tokens in Plautus, thirty-four occur in cantica and fourteen in senarii, which is the distribution we should expect for stylistically unmarked forms.<sup>17</sup> However, when we look at these fourteen tokens more closely, we can see that the criterion of distribution alone does not establish much because most of the forms are found in contexts where Plautus normally uses elevated language:

1. invocations of gods (*Bacch.* 848, *Rud.* 1348); compare:

- (6) (A soldier is pretending to be angry.)

Nam neque Bellōna mi umquam neque Mārs crēduāt,  
ni illum exanimālem *faxō*, sī conuēnerō,  
nīue exhērēdem fēcerō uītae suae. (*Bacch.* 847–9.)

For never shall Bellona or Mars trust me any more, if I *shall* not *have done* him to death, if I've found him, or if I shall not have disinherited him of his life.

2. legal language (*Asin.* 770, 794, *Rud.* 811<sup>18</sup>) and threats, which are often phrased like legal language (*Capt.* 124, 695);
3. asides by someone overhearing a conversation (Happ 1967: 182) and moralizing soliloquies (*Asin.* 818, *Stich.* 192).

<sup>16</sup> See Ch. 1 for a general outline of metre and register.

<sup>17</sup> Only five of the tokens in cantica are in sung passages, the others are in recited long verses.

<sup>18</sup> See Marx (1928: 160 ad loc.).

Five tokens remain. All of them are in passages where high register is not unusual. The form in *Persa* 393 for example is prefaced by the bombastic statement *pol deum uirtūte dicam et maiōrum meum*, 'by Pollux, I shall speak by the excellence of the gods and of my ancestors.' *Respexis* in *Aul.* 58 is used by Euclio, who has a predilection for archaic forms, as we shall also see in Ch. 7. Agorastocles in *Poen.* 428 says *si istuc lepide effexis* just before he attempts a grand speech with an *adynaton*. In *Pseud.* 533, *sed si nōn faxis* follows a hyperbolic comparison with King Agathocles. And *Epid.* 441 is spoken by Periphanes, a boastful character who used to be a *mīles glōriōsus*.

There cannot be any certainty that all the passages listed above belong to a higher style, but the assumption must be that most of them do. If so, we can reasonably conclude that the sigmatic indicative forms in subordinate clauses belong to a higher register, and the same will be true of the one token in Terence. The other sigmatic forms in subordinate clauses in Archaic Latin do not contradict this finding. Of the thirty-three tokens, twenty-five are in laws, where formal language is normal.<sup>19</sup> Higher register is also appropriate in the remaining instances: three of them occur in tragedies by Pacuvius and Accius, one is in Ennius' *Annals*, and three are in a *dēuōtiō* cited by Macrobius:

(7) *Sī haec ita faxitis ut egō sciam sentiam intellegamque, tunc quisquis uōtum hoc faxit ubiubi faxit rēctē factum estō ouibus ātrīs tribus. Tellūs māter tēque Iuppiter optestōr.* (Macr. *Sat.* 3. 9. 11.)

If ye *shall* so *have done* this that I shall know, feel, and understand, then this offering, whoever *shall have made* it, wherever he *shall have made* it, shall have been made correctly with three black sheep. I invoke thee, Mother Earth, and thee, Jupiter.

In such a prayer formula we expect solemn language.

The fact that the sigmatic forms in subordinate clauses belong to a higher register may be interpreted in different ways. At one extreme, high register may signal that the forms have lost their productivity and are restricted to formulae that have an archaic and solemn ring to them. Is this a likely interpretation for the forms in Plautus and

<sup>19</sup> There are thirty-five tokens outside Plautus and Terence, but one is *faxō* in a main clause and one is in a fragmentary clause (in the treaty between Rome and Callatis).

TABLE 6.3. Sigmatic futures and future perfects in subordinate clauses in Plautus

|                                      | Sigmatic futures | Regular future perfects | Total | Sigmatic futures (%) |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|-------|----------------------|
| Conditional clauses with <i>sī</i>   | 36               | 169                     | 205   | 17.56                |
| Conditional clauses with <i>nīsī</i> | 12               | 35                      | 47    | 25.53                |
| Relative clauses                     | 2                | 43                      | 45    | 4.44                 |
| Temporal clauses                     | 3                | 107                     | 110   | 2.73                 |
| Total                                | 53               | 354                     | 407   | 13.02                |

Note: I include *sīue* and other alternatives under *sī*, and also *nīue* and similar expressions under *nīsī*. In the table above I have excluded the 156 regular future perfects in main clauses, the four regular future perfects dependent on *faxō*, and one token that is in an indirect question.

Terence? In relative and temporal clauses they are indeed so rare that they can hardly be called productive in Plautus, and in Terence they do not occur at all in these contexts. However, in conditional clauses there are forty-eight tokens in Plautus (as opposed to the one form in Terence). This is not a negligible number; can we therefore call the sigmatic indicatives productive in Plautine conditional clauses? Since they are not found in set phrases, and since the forty-eight tokens belong to twenty-seven different verbs rather than just three or four, the sigmatic future is unlikely to be fossilized. We may qualify this assertion by comparing the figures for the sigmatic indicatives with those for the future perfects, which, as we have seen, have the same meaning, but a different register (Table 6.3).

There are 53 sigmatic futures and 354 regular future perfects in Plautus' subordinate clauses, which make up 13.02% and 86.98% of the total, respectively. This ratio does not recur among all clause types: relative and temporal clauses with sigmatic forms are disproportionately rare, while conditional clauses with *sī* and *nīsī* have more sigmatic forms than the average 13.02%.<sup>20</sup> Thus the sigmatic futures have a certain productivity in conditional clauses with a higher register in Plautus. In Terence, on the other hand, the formation is fossilized. The regular future perfects in Terence are more or less distributed as in Plautus, except that they are disproportionately rare in *nīsī*-clauses; there are 41 tokens in main clauses, 51 in conditional

<sup>20</sup> The likelihood that this finding is statistically significant is higher than 99.95%, as a t-test shows.

clauses with *sī* and the like, only 2 in conditional clauses with *nīsī*, 13 in relative clauses, and 32 in temporal clauses. But while we have 98 regular future perfects in subordinate clauses, there is only one sigmatic token in Terence, *faxis*, which again occurs in a *sī*-clause.

## THE SIGMATIC FORMS IN MAIN CLAUSES

The only form that occurs in main clauses is *faxō*: there are forty-one instances in Plautine cantica, twenty-nine in his senarii, nine in Terence, and one in Afran. *com.* 67. They are found in different constructions, for example in the type *faxō hīc aderit*, which could provisionally be translated as ‘I shall bring it about that he shall be here’. Consequently this is a causative construction.<sup>21</sup>

Exx. 8 and 9 are typical:

(8) (A slave wants his master to be patient; he will reveal everything a bit later.)

Cētera haec posterius *faxō scībīs* ubi erit ōtium. (*Epid.* 656.)

I shall take care that you will know the other things later when we are free.

(9) Immo ollī mītem *faxō faciant* fūstibus. (Afran. *com.* 67.)

I shall see to it that they make him soft with cudgels.

The verb with which *faxō* is construed can be (i) a simple future as in Ex. 8 (forty-eight times in Plautus, five times in Terence), (ii) a present subjunctive as in Ex. 9 (fourteen times in Plautus, twice in Terence, once in Afranius), (iii) a future perfect (five times in Plautus), and (iv) a perfect subjunctive (once in Plautus). In addition, there is one instance of *faxō ut* (*Asin.* 897), and there is also *faxō* with a double accusative (once in Plautus and twice in Terence).

If we compare these constructions with those of Classical Latin, one obvious contrast is in the use of *ut*: *faciō ut* + subjunctive is the normal causative formation of Classical Latin, while *ut* is almost always missing here. In Archaic Latin, however, we have many sequences of verbal forms followed by subjunctives without *ut*. Particularly frequent is the type *fac* + subjunctive, where the imperative *fac*

<sup>21</sup> A general typology of causative constructions can be found in Dixon (2000).

alternates with *fac ut*; less frequent, but attested is the future *faciam* + subjunctive,<sup>22</sup> which is found alongside the ordinary *faciam ut* + subjunctive. Thus in the constructions of *faxō* we must assume that the forms without *ut* are the original ones, while the one example with *ut* is an innovation based on *faciam ut*. What is a striking phenomenon is not the absence of *ut*, but the presence of a future or future perfect in the slot otherwise occupied by the subjunctive. This could perhaps be explained if *faxō* began as a parenthetical causative construction.<sup>23</sup>

Are there any semantic differences between the constructions? As far as I can see, *faxō* + simple future and *faxō* + present subjunctive are not distinct from each other. They occur in the same contexts, and there are no restrictions as to what verbs can be governed by *faxō*. We find both *faxō scībīs* and *faxō sciās* ('I shall make you know'). In other words, *faxō* can be combined with stative verbs. However, we also encounter both *faxō dīcēs* and *faxō dīcāt* ('I shall make you/him say'). Thus *faxō* can be combined with telic events as well.<sup>24</sup>

Just as *faxō sciās* means 'I shall bring it about that you know', the only instance of *faxō* + perfect subjunctive is of the type 'I shall bring it about that you have done':

(10) (A hanger-on is angry because he did not get the lunch with Menaechmus which he had hoped for.)

*Faxo* haud inultus prandium *comēderīs*. (*Men.* 521.)

*I shall take care* that you *have* not *eaten* the lunch unpunished.

Menaechmus has already eaten, so *comēderīs* must have past reference and consequently be a perfect subjunctive rather than a future perfect.<sup>25</sup> Of course a future action such as *faxō* cannot cause a past event; but it can be the cause of results of the past action, and in

<sup>22</sup> The two instances of a 1st pers. sg. future in Plautus and Terence are in *Amph.* 63 (*faciam sīt*) and in *Amph.* 876 (*faciam...fīāt*). The form *faciam* with a subordinator occurs 38 times in Plautus.

<sup>23</sup> The status of the clauses in the future tense that are combined with *faxō* is unclear. Are they main or subordinate clauses? For other types that could be main or subordinate clauses see Pfister (1995).

<sup>24</sup> For the concept of telicity see Ch. 5.

<sup>25</sup> Future perfects stand for events anterior to another future event, but this anteriority does not extend as far as a time before the moment of speech.

this example the result is punishment, expressed in a focal and hence obligatory adjectival phrase *haud inultus* ('not unpunished').<sup>26</sup>

In those instances where *faxō* selects a future perfect, this future perfect has the value it would also have in independent main clauses.<sup>27</sup> In Ex. 11, for instance, the future perfect indicates the result of the action expressed by the verb:

(11) (Pseudolus is trying to fool a pimp and is comparing this to capturing a city.)

Iam ego hōc<sup>28</sup> ipsum oppidum *expugnātum faxo erit* lēnōnium.  
(*Pseud.* 766.)

I shall see to it that this pimp-town will be taken soon.

Pseudolus uses the future perfect not to indicate that he will be doing something, but rather that he will have done it and that the results will then be obvious to everyone.

In the other four instances, the future perfect is employed to assess the consequences of an event and does not introduce a new action.<sup>29</sup> In the English translation, we can always add 'thereby' to make it clear that no new event is introduced:

(12) (Megaronides thinks that his wife is worse than Callicles.)

Vīn commūtēmus, tuam egō dūcam et tū meam?  
*Faxo* hau tantillum *dederis* uerbōrum mihi. (*Trin.* 59–60.)

Do you want us to swap, that I take your wife and you mine? I shall (thereby) bring it about that you shall not have fooled me at all.

The future perfect *dederis* does not introduce any new action. The clause is an assessment of the consequences of exchanging wives.

<sup>26</sup> Similarly, the evaluation *nēquīquam* cannot be left out in *Bacch.* 701 (*ēmungam hercle hominem probe hodiē, ne id nēquīquam dixerit*, 'I'll trick the chap properly today so that he hasn't said it for nothing'). Cf. also *nihilō hercle eā causā magis faciētis ut egō hodie apstulerim pallam et spintēr*, 'you won't bring it about any more for that reason that I took away the mantle and bracelet today', in *Men.* 1060–1, where *nihilō*... *magis* is obligatory.

<sup>27</sup> For this value see Ch. 2.

<sup>28</sup> *Hoc* < \**hod-ke* normally scans *hocc*, but here we have iambic shortening. *Iam ego hoc* counts as two light syllables.

<sup>29</sup> For this value of the future perfect see my discussion in Ch. 2, Risselada (2000), and also Gaffiot (1933).

Note that *faxō* is never combined with a first person singular or plural; thus the types †*faxō mactābō* and †*faxō mactēmus* are absent.<sup>30</sup> There seems to be a constraint against the causer's being identical with the causee, but this is not general, as we do have *fac assis* etc.

However, a causative interpretation is not always possible:

(13) (A father is scolding his daughter because she wants to control her husband, who loves a courtesan.)

Atque ob istanc industriam etiam *faxo amābit* amplius. (*Men.* 791.)

And he *will certainly make love* to her all the more because of your watchfulness.

Here the causative translation 'I shall bring it about that' would be absurd. Fathers in comedy do not want their daughters' husbands to love courtesans. The father is not the causer—he has nothing to do with his son-in-law's love for another woman.<sup>31</sup> In fact, the cause is his daughter's behaviour. In contexts like this, *faxō* has been reanalysed and can be translated adverbially as 'certainly' or 'surely'.<sup>32</sup> It has become a marker of certainty. There are two ways in which we can interpret this: the first is that in contexts like these, *faxō* has been reanalysed syntactically and has become an adverb (in *faxō* + future) or a 'subordinator' selecting the subjunctive (in *faxō* + subjunctive). The word 'subordinator' is not a very good one, though, because subordinators introduce subordinate clauses that cannot stand on their own, while *faxō* does not do so. But we can compare *faxō* with *forsitan* ('perhaps').<sup>33</sup> Alternatively, *faxō* could have been reanalysed purely semantically and could have become a parenthetical expression meaning 'I assume'. Both analyses have advantages. *Faxim* is

<sup>30</sup> Similarly, *faciam ut* + 1st pers. is rare as a causative construction. *Capt.* 385–7 (*faciam sēdulō, ut... id petam*) is not really an exception because the *ut*-clause is an explanatory adverbial clause, so that *faciam ut* cannot be taken causatively. Only *Hec.* 244–5 must be given a causative interpretation.

<sup>31</sup> The only way one could conceivably regard him as the causer is by taking his statement as a comic threat.

<sup>32</sup> The types *faxō erit* and *faxō sīt* express certainty, while the type *faxim sīt* (cf. *Trin.* 221) marks possibility because of the subjunctive *faxim*.

<sup>33</sup> Krebs and Schmalz (1905: 603) describe *forsitan* as a particle governing the subjunctive. Only later, the earliest instance being in *Lucr.* 5. 104, do we find *forsitan* with the indicative; when its morphological structure had become opaque to some speakers, it could take on the construction of *fortasse*, and it could be argued that from that time onwards the subjunctive was independent of *forsitan*.

verbal—it can be combined with *egō*—and means ‘I assume’, so the semantic reanalysis of *faxō* is not problematic in that respect.<sup>34</sup> On the other hand, parenthetical modalizing expressions in Latin, for instance *crēdō*, are normally in the present tense, not in the future, and so it is hard to see how the semantically reanalysed *faxō* could have future meaning. Non-parenthetical modalizing verbs usually select the *accūsātīuus cum īnfīnītīuō*.

In many cases, *faxō* can be interpreted as either causative or non-causative: if the speaker wants to be seen as the causer, *faxō* is verbal; otherwise it is a marker of certainty. But in that respect most examples are ambiguous because the speaker has a choice. Sometimes one interpretation is more likely than the other:

- (14) (Therapontigonus is looking for a man nicknamed Curculio, ‘Weevil’.)

*Therapontigonus*: Vbi nunc Curculiōnem inueniam? *Cappadox*: In trītīcō  
facillumē,  
uel quīngentōs curculiōnēs pro ūnō *faxō* reperiās. (*Curc.* 586–7.)

*Therapontigonus*: Where am I now to find Weevil? *Cappadox*: Most easily in the wheat. You *will certainly find* even five-hundred weevils instead of one.

Cappadox can hardly be seen as the causer, so we interpret this as a marker of certainty. But Exx. 13 and 14 are the only instances where *faxō* is clearly not causative.

From time to time, the context can give us hints on how to interpret *faxō*:

- (15) (A doctor is telling Menaechmus how he wants to cure him.)

*Doctor*: Elleborum *pōtābis faxō* āliquōs ūgintī diēs.

*Menaechmus*: At *egō* tē pendentem *fodiam* stimulis trīgintā diēs.

(*Men.* 950–1.)

*Doctor*: I shall see to it that you will drink hellebore for some twenty days.

*Menaechmus*: But I shall prod you, while hanging, with goads for thirty days.

Here *faxō* ought to be taken as causative because Menaechmus replies at *egō* and thus contrasts himself with the doctor; this can only make sense if the doctor uses *faxō* not as a marker of certainty, but as a

<sup>34</sup> *Faxim* will be discussed in detail in Ch. 7. For the grammaticalization of ‘I think’ and ‘methinks’ in Middle and Early Modern English see Palander-Collin (1999). See Thompson and Mulac (1991) for the grammaticalization of ‘I think’ in Modern English. In some contexts it is close to adverbial ‘maybe’.

causative verb with himself as the subject. For similar reasons, *faxō* is probably causative in *Asin.* 132, *Poen.* 1228, *Truc.* 761, and *Ad.* 847; the speakers are emphasizing that they will make something happen.

If *faxō* as a marker of certainty is not verbal any more because it has been reanalysed in some contexts, we can look at syntactic criteria as to where *faxō* has to be verbal and thus causative: in *faxō ut*, *faxō* is verbal because otherwise there could be no subordinator *ut*. And when there is *egō faxō* instead of mere *faxō*, this must be verbal; otherwise it would make no sense to express a subject *egō*. *Egō* is used eighteen times. Similarly, when *faxō* is combined with a double accusative it has to be verbal, or the clause would have no verb at all. But if *faxō* as a marker of certainty is still verbal, only *faxō* + double accusative has to be causative from a syntactic point of view.

What is the temporal meaning of *faxō*? Again, temporal adverbials do not tell us much because most of them are very general in meaning, and because in a phrase like *iam faxo hīc aderit* (*Phorm.* 308) it is not clear whether *iam* modifies *faxō* or *aderit*.<sup>35</sup>

I used 'I shall bring it about that' as a provisional translation for *faxō*. In subordinate clauses, the type *faxō* can always be interpreted as anterior; in main clauses, no such interpretation is possible, compare Ex. 9 above. In this example, the speaker simply refers to the future; it is impossible to detect any anteriority. The example can be translated perfectly, but not imperfectly: 'I'll be in the process of making them make' does not make any sense. However, this perfective interpretation can simply be the result of the kinds of speech acts we are dealing with: *faxō* is used in promises and threats, and one normally promises or threatens to do things completely, from beginning to end.

We learn more from the tenses with which *faxō* is co-ordinated.<sup>36</sup> In Ex. 16 it is the simple future:

<sup>35</sup> The most frequent adverbial is *iam* (25 instances), followed by *hodiē* (three instances). There are only two examples where the adverbial must belong to *faxō*: *Rud.* 800 and *Haut.* 341. In both cases *faxō* takes a double acc. rather than a finite verb.

<sup>36</sup> Only those cases in which *faxō* has to be verbal are considered.

(16) (Argyrippus is angry with a procuress.)

*Ībo ego ad trīsuirōs uostrae ibi nōmina  
faxo erunt, capitis tē perdam ego et filiam. (Asin. 131–2.)*

I shall go to the *trīsuirī* and take care that your names will be there, I shall destroy you and your daughter completely.

Here *faxō* is co-ordinated with two simple futures, *ībō* and *perdam*. *Faxō* in *Ad.* 847 is co-ordinated with a future perfect *uīderō* (l. 845), but as I pointed out in Ch. 2, *uīderō* is a fossilized idiom that does not indicate anteriority;<sup>37</sup> besides, *faxō* is parallel to the following *faciam* (l. 848). In *Ex.* 17 it is not clear whether there is co-ordination between *faxō* and *faciet*:

(17) (Milphio has to pacify Adelphasium.)

*Ego faxō, sī nōn īrāta's, ninnium, prō tē dabit  
ac tē faciēt ut siēs cīuis Attica atque libera. (Poen. 371–2.)*

I shall take care that, if you are not angry, he will pay for you, little horse, and he will take care/and that he will take care that you are a free Athenian citizen.<sup>38</sup>

*Faxō* and *faciēt* could be regarded as co-ordinated. Alternatively, it could be *dabit* and *faciēt* that are co-ordinated and subordinated to *faxō*. The sentence is ambiguous. In the latter case, there would be a double causative construction: *faxō faciēt ut*, with two causers, the speaker and his master, who is the subject of *faciēt*. In any case *faxō* is clearly a future. The general conclusion is that in main clauses *faxō* has simple future meaning and does not correspond to a future perfect. This is a crucial difference from the sigmatic forms of the subordinate clauses.

What about the register of *faxō* in main clauses as compared with that of the forms in subordinate clauses? We can immediately see that *faxō* is disproportionately frequent in Plautine spoken verse, which indicates that it is not marked for a particularly high register.<sup>39</sup> This conclusion becomes even more certain when we consider that all types of characters use it indiscriminately. The same can be said about

<sup>37</sup> See also Pfister (1936: 32–4).

<sup>38</sup> For *ninnium* see Maurach (1988: 100) ad loc.

<sup>39</sup> Twenty-nine of the seventy tokens are in *senarii*. By an unmarked distribution (one-quarter) we should expect seventeen or eighteen tokens there.

Terence's usage, where *faxō* is found in ordinary as well as stylistically marked passages.

With regard to the productivity of sigmatic forms in main clauses, I have already said that the only form to be found is *faxō*. There are some recurrent formulae in Plautus: among the forty-eight tokens of *faxō* + simple future, forms of *esse* occur eleven times, forms of *scīre* nine times, and forms of *adesse* four times. Similarly, *dīcere* is found three times in the future and three times in the subjunctive. However, there are twenty-four verbs in the simple future and eleven in the present subjunctive, so we are not dealing with fixed expressions. The same is true of Terence; there are far fewer tokens, but the only form to occur twice is *aderit*.

There are seventy tokens of *faxō* in main clauses in Plautus, but only nine in Terence. Given that the Plautine corpus is about three and a half times larger, we can see that Terence uses *faxō* only half as often as Plautus. Can we therefore conclude that *faxō* is dying out just like the other sigmatic forms? The answer is probably no. We have to take alternative causative constructions into account as well. For present purposes it is sufficient to look at the future *faciam* (1st pers. sg.). The relevant data are presented in Table 6.4.

Clearly, causative constructions in general are far more frequent in Plautus than in Terence, but the ratio of *faciam* (*ut*) to *faxō* is the same for the two authors. This means that what seems to be a diachronic change in the use of *faxō* in main clauses is in reality nothing but a difference in what types of expression Plautus and Terence prefer.

TABLE 6.4. The frequencies of causative *faciam* in Plautus and Terence

|         | <i>faciam</i> ( <i>ut</i> ) + subjunctive | <i>faciam</i> + double acc. |
|---------|---|-----------------------------|
| Plautus | 40  | 26                          |
| Terence | 7   | 1                           |

*Note:* Under *faciam ut* I also include the types *nōn faciam quīn* (Mil. 283–4) and *ūnum hoc faciam ut* (Aul. 365); these all have object clauses. I exclude the adverbial *ut*-clauses in *Capt.* 385–7 and *Persa* 662. Under *faciam* + double acc. I include the type *te ego faciam...prōinde ac meritis es*, but I exclude the type *ex mē...ūnam faciam litteram longam* (Aul. 77–8; *longam* is textually problematic).

## A RATIONALE FOR THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE SIGMATIC INDICATIVE FORMS?

I should now summarize some of my factual findings before trying to answer the questions asked at the beginning. In main clauses only the form *faxō* appears. It is relatively frequent and shows no signs of decline in Terence. By contrast, a number of verbs have sigmatic indicative forms in subordinate clauses in Plautus and other Archaic Latin texts. They are moderately frequent in conditional clauses, rare in temporal and relative clauses, and non-existent elsewhere. In Terence there is only one token of these forms in a conditional clause.

Two questions arise immediately: first, why is there a variety of forms in subordinate clauses, but not in main clauses? And second, why do we only find *faxō* in main clauses, that is, a first person singular indicative, and neither first persons of other verbs nor other persons of the same verb?

We need not be too surprised to find a difference between subordinate and main clauses. Typologically, it is well known that these two types of clauses can obey different constraints. Quite often there are prosodic and syntactic differences: in Vedic the verb is accented in subordinate clauses, but unaccented in main clauses, and in German and Dutch the word-order is not the same in the two clause types. But it has to be admitted that the Latin case is different because we are dealing with differences of morphology and register. And why do these archaic, high-register forms in subordinate clauses occur mainly in conditional protases? The reason is not entirely clear, but it may well be that old and solemn legal phrases such as *sī quisquam aliūta faxit* ('if anyone does otherwise', Lex reg. ap. Paul. Fest. p. 5) are partly responsible. After all, legal language is especially rich in conditional clauses.

The survival of *faxō* in main clauses is only understandable if *faxō* + future or subjunctive has a special idiomatic status, either as a causative construction or as a marker of certainty (be it verbal or not). As some uses of *faxō* are clearly verbal, we must ask why we have no evidence for *faxis* or other persons of this verb in main clauses. Here there may be a series of concomitant reasons. The form appears mainly in promises and threats, and speech acts like these naturally call for first-person verbs. Equally important is perhaps the fact that

the type *fac* or *facitō* + subjunctive (*fac habeant* etc.) is very frequent in Plautus; its function would partly overlap with that of a causative second person *faxis* + subjunctive, so that the latter construction would be superfluous.

## CONCLUSIONS

I asked initially what the function of the sigmatic indicative forms was and whether they indicated tense or aspect. They do mark futurity, but there seems to be a clear split between the forms used in subordinate and main clauses. Here a comparison with regular future forms is instructive; I discussed regular futures in Ch. 2. The sigmatic forms in subordinate clauses alternate with the future perfect tense and indicate future anteriority and conclusion; on the other hand, the isolated *faxō* in main clauses cannot indicate anteriority as the future perfects do, and seems much closer to the simple future tense. The examples can all be interpreted as being perfective, but synchronically this aspectual feature does not seem to be their main characteristic. The difference in usage between main and subordinate clauses naturally raises the question of how the split may have occurred and what the tokens in main and subordinate clauses have in common. The fossilized main clause *faxō* is more likely to have preserved the original value, and therefore the anterior meaning of the other forms seems to be secondary. Two factors may have caused them to take on the meaning of anteriority which the future perfects have: first, the preponderance of anterior statements in some types of subordinate clauses in general and in the protases of conditionals in particular, and second, the fact that the sigmatic indicatives are restricted to telic verbs, and that the forms can always be interpreted as perfective.

As we have seen, the productivity of the sigmatic forms is limited. In conditional clauses they are still a real presence in early laws and Plautus, but almost entirely absent from Terence. After that they only survive as archaisms. This is not surprising since their semantic content does not differ from that of the future perfect, which is much better integrated into the regular Latin tense system. To judge from Terence, *faxō* in main clauses had a longer life, partly because its

idiomatic uses guaranteed its survival. However, as a causative its role was taken over by *faciam ut*, while there were other contenders for its function as a marker of certainty. Morphologically, *faxō* was isolated, and that furthered its disappearance.

With regard to the question of why the forms die out in the way they do, it seems that the lack of integration into a paradigm combined with the lack of a special meaning is one reason. Moreover, it is the forms in subordinate clauses that die out first, presumably because they are stylistically marked.

There remains the question of the historic origin of the forms,<sup>40</sup> but that will have to be discussed in the context on the one hand of the results mentioned here, and on the other hand of the sigmatic subjunctives (*faxim* etc.). I shall turn to the sigmatic subjunctives in the next chapter and to the historic origins of the forms in Ch. 11.

<sup>40</sup> Sjögren (1906: 1) believes that they go back to aorists, but Meiser (1998: 182–3) suggests desiderative origin. Commentaries, with the exception of Shipp (1960: 182), by and large do not even mention this controversy.

## The Sigmatic Subjunctive in Archaic Latin

Now that I have examined the sigmatic futures, I can turn to their subjunctive counterparts, the types *faxim*, *faxīs* and *amāssim*, *amāssīs*.<sup>1</sup> It is important to compare them with the regular subjunctives. For this reason, the results of Chs. 3 and 4, where I discussed the sequence of tenses and subjunctival prohibitions, will be useful again and again in the present chapter.

The first observation to be made is that the sigmatic subjunctive is already on its way out in Archaic Latin. While Plautus still has 106 tokens belonging to 34 different verbs, Terence has only 12 tokens belonging to 4 verbs. Although the corpus of Terence is about three times smaller than that of Plautus, the decline is obvious. Moreover, even in Plautus the sigmatic subjunctives are relatively rare. In two comedies randomly chosen, *Aul.* and *Curc.*, there are nine verbs with a total of thirteen sigmatic subjunctives. By contrast, we find 559 regular subjunctives formed from 212 verbs in these two plays. 460 of them (around 82%) are in the present tense, 53 in the imperfect, 36 in the perfect, and 10 in the pluperfect.

Outside Plautus and Terence, we find twenty sigmatic subjunctives in Archaic Latin:<sup>2</sup> five in Ennius, four in Pacuvius, two each in Cato, Lucilius, Accius, and Afranius, and one each in Naevius, Caecilius, and Cornelia (the mother of the Gracchi).<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This chapter is based on de Melo (2005).

<sup>2</sup> The data in this chapter are based on my own reading and a search in which I employed Neue and Wagener (1897: 507–17) and the *BTL. Capsit* in Enn. *ann.* 319 and *faxsit* in Pacuu. *trag.* 424 could be futures or subjunctives; there is not enough context to be sure.

<sup>3</sup> The authorship of this text has always been a matter of dispute; for a short discussion see Horsfall (1989: 41–2).

In what follows, I shall look at the frequency and productivity of the forms in more detail. After that, I can examine their register. I shall then try to find out what tenses they are combined with and what their temporal reference is; here the results of Chs. 3 and 4 will be helpful. In the last part of my analysis, I shall point out some anomalies in their distribution. As I depend on statistics in the first and fourth sections, I must restrict myself to Plautus and Terence there.

## FREQUENCY AND PRODUCTIVITY

How can we gain a better understanding of the productivity of sigmatic subjunctives such as *faxim* and *ausim*? We could compare their frequency in Plautus and Terence with that of the regular forms from the same verbs used by these two authors (*faciam*, *audeam*, etc.). The figures speak for themselves. Plautus has 106 sigmatic and 881 regular forms; Terence has 12 sigmatic versus 291 regular subjunctives. The shift is from 10.74% of sigmatic forms to 3.96%. The loss of productivity is apparent.

Besides, sigmatic forms are more frequent in main than in subordinate clauses, as Rix noted (1998a: 623). It is the other way round for regular subjunctives. In my calculations I shall include the prohibitions with *cauē* among the main clauses because that is what they are pragmatically. I shall, however, divide half and half the other clauses that are ambiguous between main and subordinate clauses. This may not always lead to whole figures. 76.42% of the sigmatic forms in Plautus are used in main clauses (81 out of 106 tokens),<sup>4</sup> but only 32.29% of the regular subjunctives occur in main clauses (284.5 out of 881 tokens).<sup>5</sup> The figures for sigmatic subjunctives are not very high in Terence, but we can observe the same tendency: 83.33% of the sigmatic subjunctives are used in main clauses (10 out of 12 tokens), while it is 38.14% for the regular forms (111 out of 291 tokens).<sup>6</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Of the 106 sigmatic subjunctives, 79 are unambiguous main clause subjunctives, and four subjunctives are in clauses that could be either main or subordinate clauses.

<sup>5</sup> Among the 881 clauses with regular subjunctives, we find 280 that are clearly main clauses and nine that could be either main clauses or subordinate.

<sup>6</sup> There are 110 unambiguous main clause subjunctives, and two subjunctives are in clauses that could be either main or subordinate clauses.

TABLE 7.1. The productivity of sigmatic subjunctives in main and subordinate clauses

|                             | Sigmatic<br>subjunctives | Regular<br>subjunctives | Sigmatic<br>subjunctives (%) |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| Main clauses Plautus        | 81                       | 284.5                   | 22.16                        |
| Main clauses Terence        | 10                       | 111                     | 8.26                         |
| Subordinate clauses Plautus | 25                       | 596.5                   | 4.02                         |
| Subordinate clauses Terence | 2                        | 180                     | 1.10                         |

Again, we can calculate the percentages of sigmatic subjunctives in main and subordinate clauses. This gives us the results outlined in Table 7.1.

As will be seen, the sigmatic forms, if compared with their non-sigmatic counterparts from the same verbs, are reasonably productive in Plautine main clauses. More than a fifth of subjunctives thus used are sigmatic. In main clauses in Terence, this figure does not even reach 9%. In subordinate clauses, on the other hand, the figures are very low in both Plautus and Terence, 4.02% and 1.10% respectively.<sup>7</sup> Perhaps this distribution is not surprising. If a form is about to die out, its use is a conscious decision. In main clauses, subjunctives fulfil various functions, so that the choice between the moods is meaningful. Outside main clauses the subjunctive is often little more than a marker of subordination; in final *ut*-clauses, for example, only subjunctives, but not indicatives, can be employed—there is no choice. The sigmatic subjunctives, then, are used less in subordinate clauses because they have less ‘meaning’ there.

Forty-four of the 106 sigmatic subjunctives in Plautus belong to the verb *facere*. Does this mean that *faxim*, *faxis*, etc. have been preserved better than other sigmatic subjunctives, or can this high proportion be explained by the fact that *facere* is such a frequent verb? If we add the 106 sigmatic subjunctives in Plautus to their 881 regular counterparts, we get a total of 987 tokens. The 106 sigmatic forms make up 10.74% of this total. If all the verbs considered were equally likely to have sigmatic forms, we should expect each verb to have the same pattern of distribution: 10.74% of sigmatic subjunctives and

<sup>7</sup> It is more than 99.95% likely that the preference of sigmatic forms for main clauses is statistically significant.

TABLE 7.2. Sigmatic versus regular subjunctives in Plautus: verbs

|                        | Sigmatic | Regular | Total | Sigmatic (%) |
|------------------------|----------|---------|-------|--------------|
| <i>facere</i>          | 44       | 293     | 337   | 13.06        |
| <i>audēre</i>          | 10       | 10      | 20    | 50           |
| <i>seruāre</i>         | 6        | 22      | 28    | 21.43        |
| <i>dīcere</i>          | 6        | 209     | 215   | 2.79         |
| <i>cūrāre</i>          | 4        | 30      | 34    | 11.76        |
| The 30 remaining verbs | 36       | 317     | 353   | 10.20        |
| Total                  | 106      | 881     | 987   | 10.74        |

Note: I have included the present subjunctives of *appellāre* among the regular subjunctives of 'other verbs'. *Appellāre* does not have any sigmatic forms in Plautus, but one sigmatic subjunctive in Terence. Apart from the verbs *facere*, *audēre*, *seruāre*, *dīcere*, and *cūrāre*, no verb in Plautus has more than two sigmatic subjunctives. Seven verbs have two subjunctives each, the other 22 verbs have one each.

89.26% of regular forms. However, this is not the case. The distribution of forms is presented in Table 7.2.

The proportion of sigmatic and regular subjunctives of *facere* is not quite as expected: there are 13.06% instead of 10.74% of irregular forms.<sup>8</sup> But the differences are not great. This means that the high number of sigmatic subjunctives of *facere* can by and large be explained by the high frequency of this verb. However, there are more sigmatic forms of *audēre* than we might have expected. The figures are striking: ten out of twenty tokens are sigmatic. *Seruāre* has fewer sigmatic forms, but also fewer regular subjunctives. Six of the twenty-eight tokens are sigmatic, that is 21.43%. Sigmatic forms of *dīcere* are less productive than average: six sigmatic forms out of 215 forms in total equals 2.79%. *Cūrāre* has four sigmatic tokens, which is what we might have expected. For all other verbs taken together, the relative frequency of sigmatic forms is 10.20%. Although the sigmatic forms are less productive in Terence than in Plautus, we might expect at least the sigmatic subjunctives of *facere*, *audēre*, and *seruāre* to survive. *Faxint* should survive not because it is so productive, but because the absolute frequency of *facere* is high.

In Terence, the sigmatic forms of *facere* and *audēre* have indeed survived, but even they have lost some of their productivity: eight sigmatic subjunctives of *facere* out of a total of 117 regular and irregular

<sup>8</sup> The likelihood that this pattern is statistically significant is between 90% and 95%, as a t-test shows.

subjunctives equals 6.84%, and two sigmatic forms of *audēre* out of a total of eight subjunctives equals 25%. The absence of sigmatic forms of *seruāre* is perhaps not too surprising: there are also merely seven regular subjunctives of this verb. There are only two more sigmatic subjunctives in Terence, *appellāssis* and *excessis*.

Of the twenty remaining tokens in Archaic Latin, five belong to *facere*, two each to *audēre*, *āuerruncāre*, *mactāre*, and *prohibēre*, and one each to *agere*, *fortūnāre*, *mactāre*, *nocēre*, *perpetuāre*, *seruāre*, and *turpāre*.

## REGISTER

Obsolescent forms are often confined to the more formal registers of the language. Is this also true of the sigmatic subjunctives? A criterion that is frequently used to discover register differences is distribution over verse types, but in previous chapters we saw that this in itself does not establish much. In Plautus, elements of the elevated style are said to occur in *cantica* without any particular reason, while in *senarii* their presence is usually motivated by special circumstances: they may, for example, be used in prayers.<sup>9</sup> Nowhere, however, is their use obligatory. Of the 106 sigmatic subjunctives in Plautus, 64 are in *cantica* and 42 in *senarii*.<sup>10</sup> For the ten sigmatic forms of *audēre*, higher register is unlikely because they are as frequent as the regular subjunctives. Five of the ten sigmatic tokens of *audēre* can be found in *senarii*.

This leaves us with 37 other sigmatic subjunctives in Plautine *senarii*. Fifteen of them are forms of *facere*, and Happ does not think that they belong to a higher register. In order to see whether *dī faxint* and *dī faciant* differ in their stylistic levels, we can look at the one passage in Plautus where there might be a contrast between them:

<sup>9</sup> See Ch. 1 for a general outline of the technique I am using here. The register of the sigmatic forms is also the subject of Happ (1967: 79–92), with whom I agree on most points. His classification of passages where higher register is appropriate is similar to mine.

<sup>10</sup> It is surprising that of the 64 tokens in *cantica* only four are in *mūtātis modis cantica*, while 60 are in long verses.

(1) (Lyconides is trying to make Euclio well-disposed towards him because he has to confess something.)

*Lyconides*: 'Ita dī *faxint*' inquitō.

*Euclio*: Ita dī *faciant*. *Lyconides*: Et mihi ita dī *faciant*. Audī nunciam.

(*Aul.* 788–9.)

*Lyconides*: Say 'may the gods *do so*'. *Euclio*: May the gods *do so*. *Lyconides*: And may they *do so* for me. Listen now.

There is obviously no temporal difference here, and we can see from Lyconides' reaction that he heard what he wanted. If we take Happ's stance, we must regard *faxint* and *faciant* as equivalent not only in time reference, but also in register. The joke then, if we can still speak of a joke, merely consists in using a morphologically different, but semantically equivalent form, in other words, in obeying the spirit, but not the letter of Lyconides' request. However, if we were to adopt this position, we should ignore the way in which the sigmatic forms are used in *Aul.* There are fifteen sigmatic forms (twelve subjunctives, two indicatives, and one infinitive) in this comedy. Ten of them are employed by Euclio, who seems to have a certain predilection for archaic sigmatic forms—and also for *perduint* and the like. Even if we exclude the sigmatic forms of *facere* and *audere* as being stylistically neutral,<sup>11</sup> the picture does not change: in that case, there are only eight relevant sigmatic forms in total, but Euclio still uses five of them.<sup>12</sup> Thus it seems that Plautus is trying to characterize Euclio by giving him such forms.<sup>13</sup>

A few lines before our passage, Lyconides employed a regular form of *facere* in a wish; note that *faxīt* would also be possible metrically:

(2) (Lyconides has promised to help Euclio.)

*Euclio*: Id<sup>14</sup> sī fallis? *Lyconides*: Tum mē *faciāt* quod uolt magnus Iuppiter.

(*Aul.* 776.)

*Euclio*: If you deceive me? *Lyconides*: Then *may* great Jupiter *do* with me what he wants.

<sup>11</sup> This is certainly true of *faxō* in l. 578 and *ausim* in l. 474, both used by Euclio.

<sup>12</sup> Out of the 831 complete lines, Euclio has 296 if we count every line which he does not have to himself as half a line. That is, a bit more than a third of the lines belong to Euclio, but he has around two thirds of the old forms.

<sup>13</sup> Terence also characterizes old men by giving them archaic or long-winded expressions, see Maltby (1979).

<sup>14</sup> Camerarius suggested *quid* instead of *id*, which is quite tempting.

Here Lyconides is merely trying to reassure Euclio that he is on his side. In Ex. 1 above, on the other hand, Lyconides wants to make Euclio well-disposed towards him. It seems to me that he does so partly by ‘accommodation’, by using Euclio’s old-fashioned way of speaking. Euclio then turns the tables and, in a good-humoured way, employs Lyconides’ more modern style—another instance of accommodation.<sup>15</sup> The joke consists in the unusual constellation: the young man uses the archaic and solemn form, while the old-fashioned and conservative Euclio employs the regular, more modern present subjunctive.

Consequently there is no reason to assume that *faxint* has a lower register than, for example, *locāssim*. Only the sigmatic forms of *audēre* can, on account of their distribution, be *a priori* considered stylistically neutral. If the remaining 37 sigmatic subjunctives in senarii belong to an elevated register, at least some of them ought to be in contexts where such a style is appropriate. This is indeed the case; they are attested in:

1. prologues and introductory scenes:<sup>16</sup> *Amph.* 69, 71, *Aul.* 50, *Poen.* 27, *Pseud.* 14, 37, 79;
2. wishes with divine subjects or prayers: *Aul.* 585, *Capt.* 172, *Cas.* 324, *Merc.* 285, *Most.* 464, *Vid.* 86, *Cornicula* iv;
3. moralizing soliloquies: *Aul.* 494, *Merc.* 826, *Persa* 73, *Pseud.* 1022,<sup>17</sup> *Trin.* 221, *Truc.* 60, 62a, 348;<sup>18</sup>
4. lines in scenes full of pathos or spoken by people trying to achieve dramatic effects: *Capt.* 149: two tokens; a hanger-on missing his patron, *Capt.* 712: Tyndarus justifying his deeds, *Mil.* 1125: Palaestrio playing the prudent and wise adviser, *Most.* 523 and 526: a slave trying to scare his master, *Poen.* 1091

<sup>15</sup> A nice case of one speaker imitating the other is in *Rud.* 1205–26, where first Trachalio uses the word *licēt* excessively, and then Daemones does the same. Accommodation in bilingual settings is discussed extensively in Adams (2003a, especially 351–3); see also Shipp (1953: 110), who argues that Calidorus uses the Greek word *εὐρετής* in *Pseud.* 700 in order to speak like his example Pseudolus.

<sup>16</sup> Three of the tokens are in wishes with divine subjects: *Aul.* 50, *Pseud.* 14, 37.

<sup>17</sup> In this scene we also find *fuant* (l. 1029) and *aduenāt* (l. 1030), for which see Ch. 10.

<sup>18</sup> The passage is moralizing, but this line is actually a joke.

and 1093: Hanno, still looking for his daughters, has found his nephew, *Vid.* 83 and 91: an old man<sup>19</sup> whose son is in captivity;

5. other highly marked passages: *Bacch.* 598: deliberate choice of grotesque words, for example *nucifrangibula* instead of *dentēs*, *Bacch.* 910: earnest entreaty, *Cas.* 347: hyperbole, *Poen.* 446: the speaker has just finished his bombastic, but confused address, *Rud.* 1345: oath.

It is not absolutely certain that all these passages are in elevated language, but most of them probably are. This makes it likely that the sigmatic forms prefer high-register contexts.<sup>20</sup> If so, the same will be true of Terence, where the small number of tokens precludes firm statements about style.

The twenty sigmatic subjunctives outside Plautus and Terence do not contradict this finding. The five tokens in Ennius are in his funerary epigram (fr. uar. 18), the *Annals* (*ann.* 317), and his tragedies.<sup>21</sup> Other tragedians also have such subjunctives: Pacuvius has four<sup>22</sup> and Accius has two.<sup>23</sup> Here high register is appropriate, just as in the prayer in Cato *agr.* 141. 2–3, which contains *prohibēssīs* and *seruāssīs*. Four tokens come from fragments of comedy: Naevius' *st, tacē, cauē uerbum faxīs* (*com.* 46–7) is too fragmentary to allow any stylistic analyses, and even its metre must remain unclear; one token from Afranius is in a canticum (*com.* 264), and one each from Caecilius and Afranius is in *senarii*.<sup>24</sup> Again, the lack of context makes it impossible to detect particular registers. The same is true of the two tokens in Lucil. 653 and 1195. Cornelia uses *ausim* in a letter (Nep. fr. 59 Marshall); the register does not seem particularly high, which is in accordance with what I said about forms of this verb.

<sup>19</sup> As far as the fragments allow judgment on this matter, it seems that Plautus characterizes this old man, Dinia, through his use of old-fashioned forms.

<sup>20</sup> Obviously, my analysis contradicts Cannegieter's statement about sigmatic forms completely (1896: 97): 'Apud Plautum vivunt adhuc in sermone familiari vel paene vulgari, apud Terentium evanuerunt in sermone politiore.'

<sup>21</sup> Enn. *scaen.* 239, 261, and 288.

<sup>22</sup> Pacuu. *trag.* 112, 123 (two tokens), and 297.

<sup>23</sup> Acc. *trag.* 147 and 556.

<sup>24</sup> Caecil. *com.* 140 and Afran. *com.* 83.

COMBINATION WITH OTHER TENSES, TIME  
REFERENCE, AND OTHER FEATURES

Since the sigmatic subjunctives are rare and cannot be formed from every verb, we can ask ourselves what are the semantic and syntactic equivalents of the sigmatic subjunctives in verbs which have no such forms. The positions on this are not always stated clearly in the secondary literature. The chief reason is that the distinction between tense and time reference has not always been drawn. However, this difference will turn out to be crucial for our forms. It can be exemplified with the perfect subjunctive. In most cases, the perfect subjunctive expresses anteriority or past time:

- (3) (A slave is afraid that a fellow-slave could have done something wrong.)

Metuo in commūne nē quam fraudem *frausus* sīt. (*Asin.* 286.)

I fear that he *might have made* some mischief involving the two of us.

Here the slave is afraid that his comrade has already committed the offence. In prohibitions of the type *nē fēceris*, on the other hand, the perfect does not have past reference, as can be seen from the fact that a subordinate clause dependent on it never takes secondary sequence (see Ch. 4). In fact, it must have future reference, just as the present tense subjunctive in the same contexts.

Vairel (1981: 270–1) says that sigmatic subjunctives have the same time reference as present subjunctives. Jasanoff (1987: 182) goes further by claiming that *faxim* is ‘associated with a present subjunctive’, which comes close to regarding the forms as equivalent also with regard to their distribution over the various clause types. A hundred years earlier, in fact, Madvig (1887: 456–7) had already pointed out that *faxim* and *faciam* have the same time reference.

By contrast, Meiser (1993: 168 n. 5) states explicitly that *faxim* is not equivalent to *faciam*, but is a potential subjunctive of the perfective *faxō*.<sup>25</sup> It is not clear whether this is supposed to adopt Porzig’s position. Porzig (1960: 181) believed that the usage of *faxō* and *faxim* corresponded to that of the regular *perfectum* forms. Consequently

<sup>25</sup> In Ch. 6 I claimed that all sigmatic futures are perfective and telic. This is not the case for the sigmatic subjunctives. *Sī licēssīt* ‘if it were allowed’ in *Asin.* 603 is atelic and imperfective. (In Ch. 11 I shall argue that the forms in *-āss-* and *-ēss-* are innovations.)

we might expect *faxim* to have past meaning in some contexts as well as future meaning in prohibitions.

Thomas's view (1956: 206–7) is somewhere in between: *faxim* originally had no meaning of anteriority, but acquired it later on in some subordinate clauses (*sī, ubi*) by association with the perfect subjunctive. Clearly there is no agreement on the value of the sigmatic forms, which means that results can only come from a fresh analysis of the texts.

In main clauses, sigmatic subjunctives occur in fulfillable wishes with present or future reference,<sup>26</sup> in prohibitions,<sup>27</sup> in potential or unreal statements and questions,<sup>28</sup> and once in Ennius in a command.<sup>29</sup> In wishes, the sigmatic forms could be replaced by present subjunctives:

- (4) (An old man is glad that his sons-in-law have returned from abroad.)

Ita mē dī bene *ament* mēāsque mihī<sup>30</sup> bene *seruāssint* filiās,  
ut mihi uolup est, Pamphilippe, quia uōs in patriam domum  
rediisse uideō. (*Stich.* 505–7.)

*May* the gods *love* me and *keep* my daughters *safe* for me, I am delighted, Pamphilippus, to see that you have returned home to our country.

*Seruāssint* refers to an action that the gods should be doing now as well as in the future. The only regular tense allowed in such contexts is the present subjunctive.<sup>31</sup> In Ex. 4, the sigmatic form is in fact co-ordinated with such a present subjunctive, namely *ament*. I discussed above the one passage in Plautus where the sigmatic subjunctive in a wish is not co-ordinated with, but actually replaced by a present subjunctive (Ex. 1). While there may be a change of register or tone,

<sup>26</sup> 29 times in Plautus, three times in Terence, and five times elsewhere in Archaic Latin (Afran. *com.* 264, Enn. *scaen.* 288, Lucil. 1195; the forms in Lucil. 657 and Pacuu. *trag.* 112 are co-ordinated with *monerint*).

<sup>27</sup> Thirteen times in Plautus, once in Terence, and once in Enn. fr. uar. 18.

<sup>28</sup> 22 times in Plautus, four times in Terence, and once in Cornelia (*ausim*, Nep. fr. 59 Marshall).

<sup>29</sup> Enn. *scaen.* 239: *prohibēssis scelus*; note that this is parallel to the imperative *inspice*.

<sup>30</sup> The split resolution is unproblematic because the pronoun is enclitic.

<sup>31</sup> Regular perfect subjunctives have past reference in wishes, cf. *Poen.* 799: (A pimp has just left the scene.) Advocates: *Apscessit*. Agorastocles: *Vtinam hinc abierit malam crucem*. 'Advocates: He has left. Agorastocles: May he have gone from here to be hanged.'

it is hard to imagine that there is a difference in temporal reference between the forms used by Euclio and Lyconides.<sup>32</sup>

I discussed prohibitions in Ch. 4. In prohibitions, either the present or the perfect subjunctive could be used instead of the sigmatic form:

(5) (Demaenetus has seen that his son Argyrippus is depressed and has just said so. Argyrippus denies it.)

*Argyrippus: Nē dīxīs istuc. Demaenetus: Nē sīc fuerīs. (Asin. 839–40.)*

*Argyrippus: Don't say that. Demaenetus: Don't be like that.*

Here the parallelism between *nē dīxīs* and *nē...fuerīs* suggests that the sigmatic subjunctive is equivalent to a perfect form. However, there would not have been a temporal difference if the father had said *nē sīc sīs*, so this parallelism is not conclusive. *Nec...faxīt* in Enn. fr. uar. 17–18 is also prohibitive, but different: since we are dealing with a third person here, only replacement by a present subjunctive is possible; in this fragment, the sigmatic subjunctive is in fact co-ordinated with a present tense form.<sup>33</sup>

Prohibitions containing sigmatic forms do not seem to have any special temporal or other features. The type *nē faxīs* can be either inhibitive or preventive, and if it is preventive, it can refer to the near or the distant future. *Nīl mē cūrāssīs* in *Most.* 526 could be given an inhibitive interpretation, 'stop worrying about me'. *Nē dīxīs istuc*, 'don't say that', in Ex. 5 above is simply preventive. In *Rud.* 1028, *nec tū mē quoiquam indicāssīs* 'don't give me away to anyone' seems to refer to the distant future because it is posterior to *sine me hinc abīre, tū abī tacitus tūam uiam* 'let me go away from here, and you go your way in silence' in l. 1027, and parallel to the future forms in l. 1029 (*tū tacēto, ego mussitābō*, 'you shall be silent, I shall be quiet').

Similarly, the degree of politeness is not a factor that determines the choice between the type *nē faxīs* and other tenses. In *istuc nē mihi respōnsīs* 'don't give me this reply' (*Truc.* 606), there is not a

<sup>32</sup> In *Aul.* 257, Lindsay reads *istuc dī bene [uortant]*.—*Ita dī faxint*, 'may the gods give it a good outcome.—May the gods do so.' This could be another example of parallelism between wishes with present and sigmatic forms if it is *istuc* rather than *uortant* that should be deleted.

<sup>33</sup> *Nēmō...decorēt nec...faxīt*, 'let no one...adorn or...make.' Cf. also Lucil. 1195: *ne existāt...nē boa noxīt*, 'may it not appear...may a skin disease not harm', again with 3rd-pers. prohibitions and also with parallelism between a present and a sigmatic form.

trace of politeness because an angry soldier is speaking to a slave. The soldier's higher status and his bad mood militate against the idea that the type *nē faxīs* is particularly polite. On the other hand, sigmatic forms are not excluded where politeness is expected, compare *hercle hanc quidem nihil tu amāssīs* 'by Hercules, don't love this woman' in *Mil.* 1006–7. Here a slave is trying to get his master to do something; throughout the passage, he behaves in a subservient manner.

In potential or unreal statements and questions, the sigmatic forms never refer to the past; compare *dēierāre ausim* 'I could swear' (Cornelia, *Nep. fr.* 59 Marshall). The sigmatic forms could be replaced by various subjunctives. As I discussed in Ch. 3, the regular forms for the *potentiālis* are the present and perfect subjunctives. The *irreālis* can be expressed by the imperfect, but also the present subjunctive in Archaic Latin.<sup>34</sup> The only regular form that can be used in the relevant type of wishes as well as in commands/prohibitions and potential or unreal clauses is the present subjunctive. Consequently we might hypothesize that the sigmatic forms are equivalent to present subjunctives with respect to time reference. The sigmatic subjunctives would then be non-past forms. However, this does not mean that *faxim* really is an alternative present subjunctive. The perfect subjunctive normally has past reference, but in prohibitions and potential statements it has preserved its original non-past meaning. It is conceivable that *faxim* has non-temporal features which could best be explained if we assume that it oscillates between such non-past perfect subjunctives and regular present tense forms.

What are the replacement patterns in subordinate clauses? *Vt*- and *nē*-clauses as well as subjunctival relative clauses<sup>35</sup> follow the rules for the sequence of tenses not only in Classical, but also in Archaic Latin.<sup>36</sup> The sigmatic forms in these clauses could only be replaced by

<sup>34</sup> The two tenses can even be combined without difference in meaning. In *Truc.* 830, there is a present subjunctive in the protasis and an imperfect subjunctive in the apodosis.

<sup>35</sup> There are three relative clauses with sigmatic subjunctives in Plautus, and there is one each in Pacuu. *trag.* 297 and Acc. *trag.* 147 (with the relative adverb *cūr*). In *Aul.* 420, however, the relative clause *quoi...faxim* is unreal and thus independent of the sequence rules.

<sup>36</sup> See Ch. 3. In three plays, *Aul.*, *Curc.*, and *Ad.*, there are only three exceptions to the classical rules: *Aul.* 550, *Aul.* 743, and *Ad.* 317. In each case, there is primary instead of secondary sequence.

present subjunctives because they themselves refer to the present or future, and because the superordinate verbs are never in the past:

- (6) (Euclio is praying that no one can find his pot of gold.)

Vērūm id tē *quaeso ut prohibēssīs*, Fidēs. (*Aul.* 611.)

But I *ask* you to *prevent* this, Fides.

- (7) (Philoctetes is speaking to Ulysses or Diomedes.)

Quod te *opsecro* aspernābilem  
ne haec taetritūdō mea me inculta *faxsīt*. (*Acc. trag.* 555–6.)

But I *beseech* you that this abominable, uncivilized state of mine *not* make me despicable.

In Ex. 6, *quaesō* is a present tense and takes an *ut*-clause. As this subordinate clause cannot be anterior to the act of asking, the only regular tense form that is allowed is the present subjunctive. Here the sigmatic form is used instead. The same is true of the *nē*-clause in Ex. 7, which is non-past and depends on the present tense *opsecrō*. The number of *nē*-clauses with sigmatic subjunctives is relatively great: Plautus has eight of them, Terence has two, and elsewhere we find four tokens.<sup>37</sup> There are six relevant *ut*-clauses, two in Plautus and four outside Plautus and Terence,<sup>38</sup> but one of the tokens, *Enn. ann.* 317–18, is too fragmentary and problematic to be useful to us: the main clause verb is missing. In *Cato agr.* 141. 2–3 the sigmatic subjunctives are co-ordinated with or parallel to present subjunctives, *duīs*, and the ‘rhotacized’ *sīrīs* (such ‘rhotacized’ forms will be discussed at the end of the chapter).

*Vt...faxim* in *Truc.* 348 depends on the unreal subjunctives *seruem...uīctitem* in l. 347. In Classical Latin, subordinate clauses dependent on the *irreālis* take secondary sequence. The reason is that the *irreālis* itself is not expressed by the present subjunctive in Classical Latin, but by the imperfect or pluperfect form. In Plautus, the present subjunctive in its unreal function can of course take another present subjunctive, as in Ex. 12 below: *sī ōrem ut mihi nīl crēdāt* (*Bacch.* 697), ‘if I were asking (present subjunctive) him that he should not believe

<sup>37</sup> *Acc. trag.* 556, *Caecil. com.* 140, and *Pacuu. trag.* 123 (two tokens, one parallel to a present subjunctive).

<sup>38</sup> *Afran. com.* 83, *Cato agr.* 141. 2–3 (two tokens), and *Enn. ann.* 317.

(present subjunctive) me in anything.’ So *faxim* could be replaced by *faciam*.

Sometimes the superordinate verb is a sigmatic form. In that case, the subordinate verb is always a present subjunctive. We find this for example in *Amph.* 632 (*dī faxint ... ēueniant*). Other instances are in *nē*-clauses (*Most.* 924, *Poen.* 909), a *quīn*-clause (*Aul.* 474), *ut*-clauses (*Amph.* 462, *Pseud.* 924), relative clauses,<sup>39</sup> a *quom*-clause (*Poen.* 27), a clause with *potius quam* (*Aul.* 51), and *priusquam*-clauses (*Truc.* 524, *Enn. scaen.* 239). The relative clause *quī ... dīcāt* (*Bacch.* 1055) cannot count here because the subjunctive is independent, the clause being equivalent to a conditional clause; *dem* in the *nē*-clause in *Cist.* 523 would fit in well, but is merely a conjecture.

We also find present subjunctives dependent on sigmatic forms in the type *faxim siēt*:

(8) (Megaronides is moralizing.)

Hoc ita sī fiāt, publicō fiāt bonō;  
paucī *sint faxim* quī sciant quod nesciunt,  
occlūsiorēque *habeant* stultiloquentiam. (*Trin.* 220–2.)

If it were to happen like this, it would be to the common good. I *would bet* there *would be* few who know what they don’t know, and (that) they *would keep* their stupid gossip better in check.

Here *faxim* selects the present subjunctive *sint*. The status of *habeant* is not clear: either it is also dependent on *faxim* and co-ordinated with *sint*, or it is an independent apodosis co-ordinated with *faxim* and thus parallel to the second *fiāt*. The subjunctive *sciant* is irrelevant here because it depends on *sint*, not on *faxim*.<sup>40</sup>

In all these cases, the sequence rules merely show that the superordinate sigmatic subjunctives do not have past reference, but they do not impose a present tense interpretation on them.

Some clauses are ambiguous between main and subordinate clauses. Two types are relevant here. First, some *nē*-clauses

<sup>39</sup> *Stich.* 149 (unless *sciēs*, the reading of the Palatine manuscripts, is correct), *Pseud.* 1022, *Truc.* 61–2, and *Phorm.* 554.

<sup>40</sup> The other subjunctives selected by *faxim* are: *appāreant* (*Persa* 73), *mālīs* (*Amph.* 511), *sient* (*Aul.* 495), and *sint* (*Merc.* 829); in *Truc.* 62a, *siēt* depends on *faxim*, while *siēt* in l. 63 may be either dependent on *faxim* as well or co-ordinated with it. In *Truc.* 348, *faxim* itself is in an *ut*-clause, but in turn selects *siēt*.

can be interpreted as independent prohibitions or pseudo-final clauses:

(9) (The advocates of a young man do not want him to repeat his instructions.)

Nōs tū nē cūrāssīs, scīmus rem omnem. (*Poen.* 553.)

(a) *So that* you don't worry about us—we know the whole thing.

(b) *Don't worry* about us—we know the whole thing.

Independent prohibitions can have perfect or present subjunctives as regular forms, while pseudo-final clauses are normally in the present subjunctive. *Mihi nē dīxīs* in *Mil.* 283 could also be pseudo-final ('lest you tell me'), in which case it modifies *scīre nōlō* 'I don't want to know' in the same line. Alternatively, it could be an independent prohibition parallel to the imperative *scī* 'know' in l. 282 (if restored correctly). *Nē parsīs* in *Pseud.* 79 is either pseudo-final ('lest you spare') or a prohibition ('don't spare'). *Nē tu immūtāssīs* in *Aul.* 585 is either an object clause ('that you don't change') dependent on *caue sīs tibi* 'be careful' in l. 584 or a prohibition parallel to it ('don't change'). The second interpretation seems more likely because *cauē* with a dative *tibi* does not normally take subordinate clauses.

The second type I am interested in is *cauē* + sigmatic subjunctive, for example *cauē uerbum faxīs* 'don't say a word' (*Naeu. com.* 47).<sup>41</sup> Here it is unclear whether *cauē* is a deverbalized prohibition marker like *nē*, as in *Poen.* 117, or whether it is still verbal. In the former case we could also say *cauē fēcerīs* or *cauē faciās*, while in the latter case only *cauē faciās* would be possible. Naturally, parallelism between *cauē faxīs* and other directives is not very helpful because it is unclear whether it is imperatival *cauē* on its own or the prohibitive phrase *cauē faxīs* as a whole that is parallel to the directive. There are several instances of parallelism between the type *cauē faxīs* and directives; the parallel directive expressions are imperatives<sup>42</sup> and the subjunctive.<sup>43</sup>

<sup>41</sup> Besides this token in Naevius, there are fifteen more in Plautus and two in Terence.

<sup>42</sup> *Asin.* 256, *Cas.* 404 (*caue obiexīs* is addressed to another person, but parallel), *Mil.* 1245, *Most.* 523, *Most.* 809, *Andr.* 760, and *Naeu. com.* 46.

<sup>43</sup> *Bacch.* 1189; strictly speaking, *abeāt* (*Mil.* 1126) is not parallel because it is in the 3rd pers.

Parallelism between the type *nē* (*nihil* etc.) *faxīs* and other directives can for instance be observed in Ex. 5 above; compare also *Pseud.* 232 and *Trin.* 627. If the *nē*-clauses in *Aul.* 585 and *Mil.* 283 are not subordinate, they are parallel to *cauē* and *scī* respectively (provided that *scī* has been restored correctly).

In both types of ambiguous clauses, *nē faxīs* and *cauē faxīs*, it remains unclear what regular forms Plautus and Terence would have used if they had had to replace the sigmatic subjunctives. They would have had a choice between present and perfect subjunctives, both, however, with non-past meaning.

In some conditional clauses, the sigmatic forms might be interpreted as anterior, but they can also be regarded as simultaneous like present subjunctives:<sup>44</sup>

(10) (The speaker issues a warning to slaves.)

Domum abeant, uītent ancipiti īnfortūniō,  
ne et hīc uarientur uirgīs et lōrīs domī  
sī minus *cūrāssint*, quōm erī reueniant domum. (*Poen.* 25–7.)

Let them go home and avoid double trouble, so that they aren't beaten black and blue with rods here and with whips at home if they *have not done/are not doing* their household chores when their masters come back home.

*Cūrāssint* could be replaced by *cūrāuerint* ('they have done') or by *cūrent* ('they are doing'). Both would make sense. *Cūrāuerint* would be anterior and would imply that the work has to be finished by the time the masters come back. *Cūrent* would be simultaneous and would suggest that the slaves have to be working non-stop. Since in all other instances replacement by perfect subjunctives is only possible if they occur in prohibitions or potential statements and thus have non-anterior meaning, equivalence to the present subjunctive seems more likely here.

The same situation applies to *ambāssint* and *ambāssit* in *Amph.* 69 and 71 (if restored correctly). The main clause verbs are *iussit esse*, parallel to *ōrāre... iussit* in l. 64. Since the latter have primary sequence (*eant*, *uīderint*, *capiantur*), *iussit esse* should have primary instead of secondary sequence as well. The two sigmatic forms could

<sup>44</sup> There are ten conditional clauses with sigmatic subjunctives in Plautus, and there is one in Enn. *scaen.* 261.

be interpreted as anterior or as simultaneous. In the latter case there should be the present subjunctive. Since the forms are coordinated with *duint* (l. 72), which never has past meaning (see Ch. 9), the present tense interpretation seems most likely for the sigmatic forms.

Not quite like the normal cases of parallelism, but related, are those instances where a conditional protasis and apodosis contain a sigmatic and a regular subjunctive. The most frequent combination is that of a sigmatic form and a present subjunctive or its equivalent. In Ex. 11, the sigmatic subjunctive is in the protasis, in Ex. 12, in the apodosis:

(11) (A slave says that his master would never leave his girlfriend.)

Ne iste hercle ab istā nōn pedem *discēdāt*, sī *licēssīt*. (*Asin.* 603.)

Really, by Hercules, this chap *would* not go away one foot from her if it *were* allowed.

(12) (A slave knows that his master does not trust him.)

Quem si *ōrem* ut mihi nīl *crēdāt*, id nōn *ausīt* *crēdere*. (*Bacch.* 697.)

If I *asked* him not to believe me in anything, he *would* not even *dare* to believe that.

The combinations of sigmatic and present forms above seem to suggest that these forms are temporally equivalent. *Mil.* 669 is another example of a main clause with a sigmatic form and a conditional clause with a present subjunctive beside it. It is the other way round in *Enn. scaen.* 261 (*plūs miser sim sī scelestum faxim*, 'I should be more miserable if I did something villainous'). The type *faxim siēt* is often combined with conditional clauses with present subjunctives.<sup>45</sup> *Faxim...siēt* in *Truc.* 62a is preceded by a conditional clause with the sigmatic subjunctive *faxīmus* (*Truc.* 60). In *Aul.* 228–9, the conditional clause contains the sigmatic form *locāssim*, while the main clause *in mentem uēnīt tē bouem esse*, 'it comes to my mind that you would be the ox', is equivalent to *tū bōs sīs*, 'you would be the ox'.

<sup>45</sup> I list the lines in which *faxim* stands: *Amph.* 511, *Aul.* 494 (*faxim* is also parallel to the unreal main clause subjunctive *parent* in l. 493), *Merc.* 826, *Persa* 73, and *Trin.* 221.

Ex. 13 does not really contradict my finding:

(13) (A slave has tricked his new master in order to help his previous one. Now he is telling his new master that he has done nothing wrong.)

Nam cōgitātō, sī quis hoc gnātō tuō  
tuos seruos *faxīt*, quālem *habērēs* grātiam? (*Capt.* 711–12.)

Now consider this: if one of your slaves *did* this for your son, what gratitude *would* you *feel* towards him?

Here the protasis contains a sigmatic subjunctive and the apodosis an imperfect form. This should make us cautious not to attach too much weight to cases like Exx. 11 or 12, but it does not follow that *faxīt* in Ex. 13 could only be replaced by an imperfect subjunctive. The present is still possible:

(14) (An old man says that it is not good enough to claim that one's bad behaviour is not one's own fault, but that of the wine one drank.)

Nōn placēt: in mūtum culpam cōnfers quī nōn quīt loquī.  
Nam uīnum sī fābulārī *possīt*, sē *dēfenderēt*. (*Truc.* 829–30.)

I don't like this: you lay the blame on someone dumb, someone who can't speak. For if the wine *could* talk, it *would defend* itself.

The protasis here contains the present subjunctive *possīt*,<sup>46</sup> while the apodosis is in the imperfect subjunctive. If sigmatic forms function like present subjunctives, Ex. 13 is a parallel.

So far, all the evidence has favoured interpreting the sigmatic forms as equivalent to present subjunctives, or to special perfect subjunctives with non-past meaning. In other words, the sigmatic forms seem to have present or future reference. We might wonder whether temporal adverbials confirm or contradict this finding, but most of them are not very helpful. *Tum* in *Mil.* 11 for example manifestly acts as a discourse marker rather than a temporal adverb proper.<sup>47</sup> The same is true of *nunc* in *Aul.* 228. Elsewhere, the meaning of the adverb is too vague to allow any conclusions. This is the case for *semper* in a wish in *Asin.* 654, *numquam* in a prohibition in *Capt.* 149, and *usquam* in a question in *Merc.* 154–5. In *Truc.* 348, *cis diēs paucōs* 'within a

<sup>46</sup> It would of course be easy to emend to *possēt*, as was in fact suggested by Camerarius, but it is also unnecessary.

<sup>47</sup> *Tum* is what Lindsay reads. Perhaps Bothe's conjecture *tam* is preferable because it would help us to get rid of the anacoluthon.

few days' seems to modify *siēt* rather than *faxim*. However, *posthāc* in *Phorm.* 742 and the clause *sīquid ūsūs uēnerit* 'if the opportunity will have arisen' in *Ad.* 895 are at least specific enough to show, even if we did not have any context, that the sigmatic subjunctives have future rather than past reference.<sup>48</sup> The conclusion must be that the sigmatic subjunctives are non-past forms like the present subjunctives or the perfect forms in their non-anterior uses.

## DISTRIBUTION PATTERNS

Replacement tests cannot tell us whether *faxīs* is closer to *faciās* or non-past *fēcerīs*. What might help us here is a look at the distribution of these forms over the various clause types in Plautus and Terence. Does *faxīs* pattern with *faciās* or *fēcerīs*? In Ch. 4 I examined present and perfect subjunctives in prohibitions and noted some differences in distribution: prohibitive present subjunctives occur in the second person as well as the third, while the perfect forms are restricted to the second person. However, since non-past perfect subjunctives are restricted to two types of speech acts, prohibitions and potential statements, it is best if we first compare only the types *faxīs* and *faciās* and have recourse to the perfect subjunctives only if we find distributional differences between *faxīs* and *faciās*.<sup>49</sup>

There are not many statements about distributional peculiarities in the literature. According to Rix (1998b: 266), the type *faxim* occurs mostly in wishes because the forms go back to optatives. If he is right, the regular type *faciam* should in proportion be less frequent in wishes. Rix also claims (1998a: 623) that sigmatic subjunctives do not occur in indirect speech, indirect questions, or temporal *quom*-clauses.

As the lexical meaning of a verb can influence what clause types it is used in, I have not counted all present subjunctives, but merely

<sup>48</sup> In *Cist.* 524–6, there are also three conditional clauses with future perfects anterior to the wish *faxint*. *Si hoc concredūō*, 'if I shall have entrusted this', in *Aul.* 585 is anterior to a sigmatic form as well. (For such *u*-forms see Ch. 9.)

<sup>49</sup> In Plautus, the verbs with sigmatic subjunctives have twenty prohibitive perfects and one potential perfect subjunctive. In Terence, these verbs have two prohibitive perfect subjunctives. Elsewhere, the perfect has past or anterior meaning.

TABLE 7.3. The distribution of subjunctives over main clause types in Plautus

|   | Sigmatic | Present | Total | Sigmatic (%) |
|---|----------|---------|-------|--------------|
| Commands                                  | —        | 34.5    | 34.5  | 0            |
| Prohibitions (including <i>cauē</i> )     | 30       | 12      | 42    | 71.43        |
| Wishes                                    | 29       | 63      | 92    | 31.52        |
| Potential/unreal statements and questions | 22       | 111     | 133   | 16.54        |
| Total                                     | 81       | 220.5   | 301.5 | 26.87        |

Note: Among the wishes, only two with regular forms in Plautus are negated. The type *faxim siēt* is counted among the potential/unreal statements.

those of the verbs which have sigmatic forms in Plautus and Terence. Since the sigmatic forms are more productive in main clauses than in subordinate ones, it makes sense to look at them separately. In the following tables, there are not always whole numbers because wherever tokens were ambiguous between two clause types, I split them up between the two categories. I have not split up tokens dependent on the type ‘*cauē* without *nē*’, which I counted among the main clause prohibitions. Apart from that, the following ambiguities occur: in Plautus, four clauses with sigmatic subjunctives are ambiguous between prohibitions and subordinate *nē*-clauses. In Plautine clauses with present subjunctives, eight are ambiguous between prohibitions and subordinate *nē*-clauses, and one could be interpreted as either a command or a subordinate *ut*-clause. In Terence, two present subjunctives can be found in ambiguous clauses: one is in a clause that might be either a prohibition or a subordinate *nē*-clause, and one is in a clause that might be a command or an object clause without *ut*.

Table 7.3 shows the distribution of forms over main clauses in Plautus. There are in total 81 sigmatic subjunctives and 220.5 corresponding present subjunctives in main clauses. In percentages, this is 26.87% and 73.13%. If there were no differences between sigmatic and present forms, these percentages should recur among all clause types. However, there are considerably fewer sigmatic forms in potential/unreal statements and in questions than we might have expected (16.54% instead of 26.87%). On the other hand, Plautus has slightly more sigmatic forms in wishes than we would have thought, though there are fewer than in prohibitions, *pace* Rix (1998*b*). The most striking phenomenon concerns the directives: Plautus does not

TABLE 7.4. The distribution of subjunctives over main clause types in Terence

|   | Sigmatic | Present | Total | Sigmatic (%) |
|---|----------|---------|-------|--------------|
| Commands                                  | —        | 13.5    | 13.5  | 0            |
| Prohibitions (including <i>cauē</i> )     | 3        | 0.5     | 3.5   | 85.71        |
| Wishes                                    | 3        | 28      | 31    | 9.68         |
| Potential/unreal statements and questions | 4        | 43      | 47    | 8.51         |
| Total                                     | 10       | 85      | 95    | 10.53        |

use sigmatic forms in commands, where the present subjunctive is fairly common (34.5 tokens), but in prohibitions the sigmatic forms outnumber the regular present subjunctives by far (30 sigmatic forms versus 12 regular ones).<sup>50</sup>

Similar patterns can be observed in the main clauses in Terence, although the figures are much lower (Table 7.4). There are 10 sigmatic forms and 85 present subjunctives, which corresponds to 10.53% and 89.47%. These percentages cannot be seen in all clause types. Again, commands with sigmatic subjunctives are absent, while the present subjunctive is fairly common here. But we do find three sigmatic forms in prohibitions, which is more than the number of present subjunctives.<sup>51</sup>

In subordinate clauses, there are similar restrictions. Table 7.5 presents the data for Plautus.<sup>52</sup> There are 25 sigmatic subjunctives with 465.5 present tense counterparts in subordinate clauses: the percentages are 5.10% versus 94.90%. There are more sigmatic subjunctives in conditional clauses than we might have expected.<sup>53</sup> This could be due to the influence of the sigmatic indicatives, which are

<sup>50</sup> Both patterns of distribution in directives must be statistically relevant; the likelihood for this is higher than 99.95%, as t-tests show. Once, Ennius uses a sigmatic subjunctive in a command (*prohibēsīs scelus*, Enn. *scaen.* 239).

<sup>51</sup> The likelihood that these findings are statistically relevant is higher than 99.95% for the commands and between 97.5% and 99% for the prohibitions, as t-tests show.

<sup>52</sup> The regular subjunctives in Terence are distributed in a similar way to those in Plautus: 42.5 tokens in *ut*-clauses, 18.5 in *nē*-clauses, 4 in conditional clauses, 47 in indirect questions and relative clauses, and 8 elsewhere (1 *quīn*-clause, 1 causal clause, 1 temporal clause, 2 comparative clauses, 2 limiting clauses, and 1 thematic *quod*-clause). There are only two sigmatic subjunctives.

<sup>53</sup> Two of them are in conditional clauses where the subjunctive can only be interpreted as due to indirect speech (*ambissint* in *Amph.* 69 and *ambissit* in *Amph.* 71). This contradicts Rix's statement above, but he does not accept these textually problematic cases (1998a: 620 n. 5).

TABLE 7.5. The distribution of forms over subordinate clause types

|  | Sigmatic | Present | Total | Sigmatic (%) |
|--|----------|---------|-------|--------------|
| <i>ut</i> -clauses and subject or object clauses without <i>ut</i> | 2        | 177.5   | 179.5 | 1.11         |
| Subordinate <i>nē</i>  | 10       | 45      | 55    | 18.18        |
| Conditional clauses  | 10       | 40      | 50    | 20           |
| Indirect questions and relative clauses                            | 3        | 156     | 159   | 1.89         |
| Other subordinate clauses  | —        | 47      | 47    | 0            |
| Total  | 25       | 465.5   | 490.5 | 5.10         |

*Note:* There are two subordinate clauses with regular verb forms in which *nē* is left out. I have counted them among the *nē*-clauses. The 'other subordinate clauses' are 16 *quīn*-clauses, 2 causal clauses, 6 temporal clauses, 16 comparative clauses, 4 limiting clauses (one of them negated with *nē*), and 3 *quod*-clauses (2 thematic clauses, and 1 which replaces the *AcI*).

particularly frequent in this clause type. But just as the sigmatic subjunctives in main clauses were unusually frequent in prohibitions, we find far more of them in subordinate *nē*-clauses than we might have anticipated.<sup>54</sup>

In Terence, there are only two sigmatic tokens in subordinate clauses, but both of them again in *nē*-clauses. In other types of subordinate clauses, the sigmatic forms are rare, especially so in *ut*-clauses, where we should expect to find more of them.<sup>55</sup> Since there are only five sigmatic forms in subordinate clauses other than conditional and *nē*-clauses, the absence from indirect questions<sup>56</sup> and *quom*-clauses noted by Rix could be due to chance rather than be a systematic exception. What is important here is the high number of tokens in prohibitions and *nē*-clauses as well as the low figure in commands and *ut*-clauses. There is a clear connection between commands and *ut*-clauses. Diachronically, *ut*-clauses seem to be derived from relative clauses functioning as sentence appositions, see Hettrich (1987). Leumann (1973: 424) holds a different opinion: he thinks that modal *ut* 'as' was reanalysed as final in some contexts. In either case, the subjunctive must originally have had 'jussive' function.

<sup>54</sup> The likelihood that this pattern in *nē*-clauses in Plautus is statistically significant is between 99.5% and 99.95%, as can be seen from a t-test.

<sup>55</sup> The likelihood that this pattern in Plautine *ut*-clauses is statistically significant is higher than 99.95%, as can be shown by a t-test.

<sup>56</sup> The three tokens under 'indirect questions and relative clauses' are all in relative clauses.

Another restriction shared by the perfect and the sigmatic subjunctives concerns the persons in prohibitions. We shall consider the figures for Plautus and Terence together because the differences are not great. The figures given in the secondary literature differ considerably, partly because the distinction between prohibitions and pseudo-final clauses has not always been drawn; this explains why for example Vallejo (1942: 297) has so many tokens of the prohibitive type *nē faciās*. I have not counted all present subjunctives: cases that are ambiguous between prohibitions and subordinate *nē*-clauses have not been considered. Likewise, with the exception of *cauē dirrumpātis* (*Poen.* 117), where *cauē* is clearly deverbalized, I have not included the tokens of *cauē* without *nē*, but with present subjunctives; we might be dealing with subordinate clauses. On the other hand, I have counted all the instances of the type *cauē fēcerīs* because *cauē* is deverbalized here. Sigmatic tokens in clauses that can be taken as prohibitions or as subordinate clauses have been left out, but the type *cauē faxīs* is included. *Nē* is never used here, which seems to indicate that *cauē* is deverbalized in this context. The results are as follows: in the perfect, the second person is used 42 times, whereas the third person occurs only twice. In Plautus and Terence, all 31 sigmatic subjunctives in prohibitive function belong to the second person, although the third person can be found elsewhere.<sup>57</sup> No such restrictions hold for prohibitive present subjunctives, where we have 21 tokens in the second person and 40 in the third. It is not entirely clear why the perfect and sigmatic subjunctives are so rare in third-person prohibitions. However, what is significant is that the sigmatic forms behave like perfect, not present subjunctives in cases where the perfect and the present have the same temporal reference.

## CONCLUSIONS

The sigmatic subjunctive, already rare in Plautus, is an unproductive formation in Terence. There is a decline both in the number of

<sup>57</sup> We can see it in Ennius' funerary epigram (*nec fūnera flētū faxīt*, 'let him not celebrate my funeral with tears', Enn. fr. uar. 17–18).

tokens and in the number of verbs they belong to. On the whole, the forms have been preserved better in main than in subordinate clauses. Forms of *audēre* are disproportionately prominent among the sigmatic subjunctives in Plautus, while *faxim* is only frequent because *facere* itself is so frequent. These are virtually the only sigmatic subjunctives that survive in Terence. One might associate the loss in frequency and productivity with an original higher register.

Concerning their temporal features, the sigmatic subjunctives can always be replaced by present subjunctives and seem to share their non-past reference. However, the same non-past reference is also characteristic of perfect subjunctives in potential or prohibitive function, and I wondered whether the sigmatic forms were closer to present or to non-past perfect subjunctives.

In order to find out, I looked at directives in the subjunctive. Here the sigmatic subjunctives are subject to the same restrictions as the perfect forms: they can be found in prohibitions, but not in commands, and the prohibitions are almost exclusively in the second person. The fact that the same two restrictions apply to perfect and sigmatic subjunctives, but not to present tense forms, does not seem to be due to chance. On the contrary, it could point to a common origin for the sigmatic and the perfect subjunctives; one could argue that the sigmatic subjunctives are old *perfectum* forms.

If this is correct, the question arises why the perfect subjunctives normally have past meaning, while the sigmatic forms never do. From a purely synchronic point of view, in fact, the use of perfect subjunctives in prohibitions and potential statements like *praefiscini hoc nunc dixerim* 'touch wood, I should now say this' (Asin. 491) can only be called an anomaly. Everywhere else, the perfect subjunctive expresses anteriority or past time. However, it is likely that at some prehistoric stage all perfect subjunctives had non-past reference and that the difference between present and perfect subjunctives was aspectual. In the indicative, on the other hand, the contrast between present and perfect was temporal. According to Wackernagel (1926: 250), the perfect subjunctive then acquired its past meaning by association with the corresponding indicative. It is only in prohibitions and potential statements that the non-past meaning of the perfect subjunctive has remained. By contrast, the sigmatic subjunctives do not normally have sigmatic perfect indicatives with past meaning

beside them. Only sporadically do we find a perfect indicative like *parsistī* next to a sigmatic subjunctive such as *parsīs*. Thus the sigmatic subjunctives could not acquire past meaning and kept their present or future force.

However, this absence of past indicatives is also a problem for the *perfectum* hypothesis. Consequently it seems best to assume that the *s*-formation, while originally going back to *perfectum* forms, has acquired a certain independence and productivity in the future (< subjunctive) and subjunctive (< optative). I shall discuss these questions in more detail in Ch. 11.

#### EXCURSUS: THE RHOTACIZED FORMS *IŪVERINT*, *MONĒRINT*, AND *SĪRINT*

In this chapter and the last I discussed the sigmatic indicatives and subjunctives. The morphological characteristic all of them share is the marker *-s-* after consonant or *-ss-* between vowels. However, in Latin simple *-s-* can also alternate with *-r-*, as the pair *fēstus* ‘belonging to a feast day’ and *fēriae* ‘feast days’ shows. The reason for this alternation is that simple *-s-* between vowels regularly turned into *-r-* in the fourth century BC, a sound change normally referred to as rhotacism. Does Latin have extra-paradigmatic forms that used to be sigmatic, but underwent rhotacism?

There are some indicatives and subjunctives that could belong in this category, and now that I have dealt with the sigmatic indicatives and subjunctives as such it would be interesting to examine these other forms. There are not many of them. The verbs (*ad-*) *iuuāre*, *monēre*, and *sinere* have forms with the endings of future perfects and perfect subjunctives, but with different stems. Examples of these special forms are *adiūuerō* (Enn. *ann.* 335), *monĕrint* (Lucil. 653), and *sīrīs* (Cato *agr.* 141. 3). The regular future perfects or perfect subjunctives, all of which are also attested in Archaic Latin, are *adiūuerō*, *monuĕrint*, and *sīuerīs/sīerīs*. The main question that arises with regard to the irregular forms is whether functionally and morphologically they belong with the sigmatic type *faxō/faxim* or with the normal future perfects and perfect subjunctives of the type *fēcerō/fēcerim*.

Meiser (2003: 40) believes that these forms go together with *faxō/faxim*. In *faxō* (*fac-s-ō*) the *-s-* remained because it followed a consonant, while it underwent rhotacism between vowels in *adiūuerō* < \**-iuua-s-ō*, *monērint* < *monē-s-ī-(e)nt*, and *sīrint* < *sei-s-ī-(e)nt*.

By contrast, *LLF* 596 regards *iūuerint* as a by-form of the regular perfect subjunctive *iūuerint*, by analogy to *fūerint* from older \**fūuerint*. *Monērint*, we are told, is based on *iūuerint*. Finally, *sīrint* instead of *sīuerint* is said to be an irregular short form: the regular short forms of fourth-conjugation verbs have *-ier-* as in *sīerint*, not *-īr-*. *LLF* 601 argues that the *-ī-* is the result of ‘anomalous contraction of *-ie-* to *-ī-* in entreaties’ (*mit anormaler Kontraktion ie > ī in Beschwörungen*).

From a purely morphological perspective, the approach in *LLF* seems more complicated than that in Meiser. How can *monērint* instead of *monuērint* be created on the basis of *iūuerint*? And are there any other examples of anomalous contractions in entreaties apart from *sīrīs*?

What is even more worrying is the fact that we do not find special indicatives like †*iūuī* or †*monī*. This would be odd if the forms were derived from regular *perfectum* stems, but normal if they went back to the type *capsō/capsim*, which lacks corresponding past indicatives as well.

For these reasons, Meiser’s theory seems more likely. But does it work from a functional point of view? If it does, the rhotacized forms with irregular stems ought to be closer in meaning to *capsō/capsim* than to the future perfect/perfect subjunctive. Is this really true? Before I check, it may be helpful to summarize the functional differences between sigmatic forms and regular *perfectum* futures and subjunctives:

1. *Capsō* versus *cēperō*: both types are futures with anterior and concluded meaning; in main clauses, the isolated form *faxō* and also *uīderō* have kept the older meaning of future tense without anteriority or conclusion.
2. *Capsim* versus *cēperim*: *capsim* always has non-past reference, like present subjunctives. *Cēperim* normally has past meaning, but has preserved its old non-past meaning in prohibitions and potential statements.

Since there are no great semantic differences between the futures *capsō* and *cēperō*, it does not make much sense to ask to which of the two *adiūuerō* is semantically closer. There are no special future forms of *sinere*, but (*ad-*)*iuuāre* and *monēre* have one each:

(15) (A shepherd is offering help to T. Quinctius Flaminius.)

Ō Tite, sī quid ego *adiūuerō* cūramue leuāssō  
 quae nunc tē coquit et uersāt in pectore fixa,  
 ecquid erit praemi? (Enn. *ann.* 335–7.)

O Titus, if I *shall have helped* you and shall have alleviated the worry which is now searing you and which, fixed in your heart, stirs you up, will there be any reward?

(16) (Agamemnon is asking Athena for advice.)

Dīc mihī quid faciam: quod mē *monēris*, effectum dabō. (Pacuu. *trag.* 30.)

Tell me what I should do. I shall get done what you *will have advised* me.

In Ex. 15, *adiūuerō* functions like a normal future perfect. It is anterior to the simple future *erit* and co-ordinated with the sigmatic future *leuāssō*, which has the same meaning as future perfects as well. *Monēris* in Ex. 16 also has future perfect force and is anterior to *dabō*, but it must be said that *dabō* itself is not in the manuscripts, which only have *dā*. Apart from these two instances, there are no relevant tokens because *monēre* does not have any other irregular futures and the regular and the irregular futures of (*ad-*)*iuuāre* can only be distinguished in verse because they look the same and have the same meaning, but scan differently.<sup>58</sup> Since there are no semantic distinctions between the regular and the irregular future perfects, it is impossible to tell whether (*ad-*)*iūuer-* survived in prose; except for Ex. 15 above, there are no instances of it in verse.

There is only one extra-paradigmatic subjunctive of *monēre* in Latin, cited once by Varro and twice by Nonius; they ascribe the verse in question to either Lucilius or Pacuvius:<sup>59</sup>

<sup>58</sup> Perhaps prose rhythm could also offer some help in distinguishing between two forms, but I prefer not to rely on it too much.

<sup>59</sup> Varro *ling.* 7. 102 does not comment on the morphological oddity of *monerint*, but Non. p. 816. 24 glosses *moneris* as *monueris*.

(17) *Dī monērīnt meliōra atque āmentiam āuerruncāssīnt tuam!* (Pacuu. *trag.* 112.)

*May the gods advise you better, and may they avert your madness.*

Here *monerīnt* is in a wish, just like the sigmatic subjunctive *āuerruncāssīnt*, with which it is co-ordinated. Like all regular present subjunctives and all sigmatic subjunctives, but unlike most perfect subjunctives, this rhotacized form has non-past meaning.

We have more data for the subjunctives of (*ad-*)*iuuāre*. In verse, there are three irregular subjunctives (with *-ū-*) that have non-past meaning:

(18) (Fishermen are hoping that they will get a good catch.)

Nunc Venerem hanc uenerēmur bonam, ut nōs lepide *adiūuerīt* hodiē.  
(*Rud.* 305.)

Let us now honour this good Venus here so that she *helps* us nicely today.

(19) (Tears are frequently false.)

Nōn, ita mē dīuī, uēra gemunt, *iūuerīnt*. (Catull. 66. 18.)

*May the gods help me, they have no real grief.*

(20) (Prostitutes often come from the East.)

Et quās Euphrātēs et quās mihi mīsīt Orontēs  
*mē iūuerīnt*. (Prop. 2. 23. 21–2.)

*May I find pleasure in the girls that the Euphrates and Orontes have sent me.*

In the *ut*-clause in Ex. 18, *adiūuerīt* cannot be anterior to *uenerēmur*, so it could only be replaced by a present subjunctive, not by a regular perfect form. Similarly, Exx. 19 and 20 have *iūuerīnt* in wishes with future reference, and consequently only *iuuent* could substitute for these forms. These replacement patterns resemble those of the sigmatic subjunctives.

By contrast, the regular forms with *-ū-* in verse normally behave like the average perfect subjunctives. They have past or anterior meaning unless they occur in prohibitions (*neque illōs iūuerīs*, ‘do not help them’, Verg. *Aen.* 10. 32–3)<sup>60</sup> or in potential statements (*nōn... iūuerīnt*, ‘they would not... please me’, Hor. *epod.* 2. 49).<sup>61</sup>

<sup>60</sup> This is a subjunctive, despite the short *-ī-*, see Seru. *Aen.* 10. 33.

<sup>61</sup> If we exclude these two prohibitive and potential tokens, there are six regular tokens (*-ū-* and past meaning) in Latin verse (*Most.* 691, *Acc. trag.* 357, Catull. 68. 42 (two tokens), Ou. *Pont.* 4. 10. 66, and Stat. *silu.* 4. 9. 51).

There are, however, two exceptions to this distribution in verse:

(21) (A young man wants Geta to help his cousin.)

Itane hunc patiēmur, Geta,

fieri miserum, quī mē dūdum ut dixti *adiūuerit* cōmiter? (*Phorm.* 536–7.)

Geta, shall we allow him to become miserable in this way, even though, as you said, he *helped* me generously just now?

(22) (The bridegroom is addressed in a wedding hymn.)

Bona tē Venus

*iūuerit*. (Catull. 61. 195–6.)

May good Venus *help* you.

In Ex. 21, the form with -*ū*- has past meaning, and in Ex. 22, the form with -*ū*- could be replaced by a present subjunctive. These two exceptions are of course a problem if we follow Meiser because they speak against a clear-cut semantic difference between *iūuerit* and *iūuerit* and thus also against different origin. However, if we accept the theory in *LLF*, we are no better off: in that case, all the forms with non-past meaning are hard to explain, whether they have -*ū*- or -*ū*-. Why should they have preserved non-past meaning when none of the other perfect subjunctives did? Consequently it is perhaps easiest if, like Meiser, we take *iūuerit*/*iūuerit* as a rhotacized form of the type *capsō/capsim*, and *iūuerit*/*iūuerit* as a normal future perfect/perfect subjunctive. Exx. 21 and 22 must then be explained in another way. Maybe the fact that the special subjunctive *iūuerit* and the regular perfect form *iūuerit* differed only in the quantity of the -*u*- led to a certain morphological confusion. The result would have been that the forms with -*ū*- survived as metrical variants, and that present meaning was considered a poetic licence.

In some respects, the morphological confusion between original *fēcerimus* (future perfect) and *fēcerimus* (perfect subjunctive) is similar. We find a future perfect *fēcerimus* as early as Catull. 5. 10. These developments were probably triggered by the regular shortening of vowels in final syllables before consonants other than -*s*, so that the old perfect subjunctive *fēcerit* became formally identical with the future perfect *fēcerit*. However, the confusion is not complete. *Fēcerō* is never used in *ut*-clauses or elsewhere if a subjunctive is required. Thus it seems that forms could only be mixed up if they differed merely in vowel quantities (with a concomitant difference in accentuation).

In prose, where the quantity of the *-u-* cannot be established, the meaning is regularly past unless we are dealing with potential statements. I have only found one such potential statement in prose, *adiūuerit* in Suet. *Cal.* 8. 3. The grammarians tell us neither about the short *-ŭ-* nor about any anomalies in meaning, probably because the irregular and the regular forms look so similar. Seru. *gramm.* iv. 450. 22–451. 2 and Bede (vii. 235. 10–19), who copies *verbatim* from Servius, do not speak about subjunctives, but about the future perfect. They say that it has long *-ū-* and make no mention of the special forms.

If the rhotacized subjunctives belong with the sigmatic type, what forms could the verb *sinere* have? We might expect an irregular form *sīrīs* (< \**sei-s-īs*<sup>62</sup>) next to regular *sīuerīs* (< \**sei-u-is-īs*) and shortened, but regular *sīerīs*. It is likely that these forms were to some extent confused in the manuscripts: *-ī-* is often spelt *-ei-*, and *seireis* and *siereis* can easily be mixed up. With this *caveat* in mind, we can now examine the forms we have.

Again, the grammarians tell us nothing about special forms or meanings. There are two passages where the morphology of the future perfect of *sinere* is discussed: they are once more Seru. *gramm.* iv. 450. 22–451. 2 and Bede (vii. 235. 10–19), who copies Servius. All that we find in these passages is the regular form *sīuerō*.

There are thirteen tokens with *-īr-*. All of them have non-past reference, but not all of them would allow us to assign *sīrīs* to the type *capsīs*. From a functional perspective, three of the thirteen tokens could equally well be analysed as normal perfect subjunctives: *cauē sīrīs* in *Epid.* 400 and *Bacch.* 402 are prohibitions, and here regular perfect subjunctives and sigmatic subjunctives alternate without any difference in meaning; the *nē*-clause in *Trin.* 520–1 could be a prohibition as well.<sup>63</sup> The remaining ten tokens, however, are in contexts where regular perfect subjunctives would have past reference, whereas *sīrīs* has non-past reference like the sigmatic forms. Seven of these

<sup>62</sup> If this goes back to an original sigmatic aorist, the full grade or the lengthened grade of the root is to be expected. If there was a lengthened grade, it got shortened by Osthoff's law.

<sup>63</sup> Alternatively, it could be a subordinate clause dependent on a present indicative, in which case *sīrīs* could only be replaced by a present subjunctive.

tokens are in wishes with present or future reference,<sup>64</sup> and three are in non-anterior *ut*-clauses dependent on clauses with non-past verbs.<sup>65</sup> Ex. 23 is a wish, and Ex. 24 contains an *ut*-clause:

(23) (A young man is shocked by what his friend has said.)

Nē dī *sīrint!* (*Merc.* 613.)

Heaven forbid! (= *May* the gods not *allow* it!)

(24) (Hanno is looking for his daughters.)

Deōs deāsque uenerōr qui hanc urbem colunt  
ut quod dē mēa re hūc uēnī rīte uēnerim,  
mēasque hīc ut gnātās et mēī frātris filium  
reperīre mē *sīrītis*, dī uostram fidem! (*Poen.* 950–3.)

I entreat the gods and goddesses who inhabit this city that I, having come here to do my business, may have arrived appropriately, and that you *let* me find my daughters and my brother's son; O gods, have mercy!

In Ex. 23, we could also say *sinant* because the wish has present and future force. In Ex. 24, the verb of the superordinate clause is in the present tense, and since *sīrītis* is not anterior to it, it has the force of a present subjunctive as well, in contrast to *uēnerim*, which is past. Thus the type *sīrīs* has the same replacement patterns as sigmatic subjunctives.

Regular subjunctives like *sīuerīs* and shortened *sīerīs* ought to have past meaning unless they occur in second-person prohibitions or potential statements. Three regular tokens occur in such prohibitions with *nē* and *cauē*,<sup>66</sup> and another one has past meaning (*Cic. Planc.* 87). However, two regular subjunctives do not have past meaning:

<sup>64</sup> *Bacch.* 468, *Curc.* 27, *Merc.* 613, *Nep. fr.* 59 Marshall (Cornelia), and *Liu.* 1. 32. 7, 28. 28. 11, and 34. 24. 2.

<sup>65</sup> *Poen.* 953, *Cato agr.* 141. 3, and *Macr. Sat.* 3. 9. 11. The non-past reference of our forms is further demonstrated by the fact that in *Liu.* 34. 24. 2 the extra-paradigmatic form in a wish selects primary sequence in the clause subordinate to it. *Sīrīs* in the *ut*-clause in *Cato agr.* 141. 3 is co-ordinated with or parallel to the present subjunctives *sīēs*, *dēfendās*, and *āuerruncēs*, to the sigmatic subjunctives *prohibēssīs* and *seruāssīs*, and to *duīs*, which is always non-past (*Ch.* 9).

<sup>66</sup> *Bacch.* 402 and *Cato agr.* 4 and 113. 2.

(25) (An old man tries to calm down his neighbour.)

Nē dī *sīuerint*! (Merc. 323.)

May the gods not *allow* it!

(26) (Perdiccas wants to become king, but Meleager is against it.)

Nec dī *sierint*, inquit, ut Alexandrī fortūna tantique rēgnī fastīgium in istōs humerōs ruat. (Curt. 10. 6. 20.)

He said: 'May the gods not *allow* that Alexander's rank and the importance of so great a kingdom fall on those shoulders of yours.'

In both cases, the wishes have future reference; the perfect subjunctives could be replaced by present subjunctives, and in Ex. 26 this analysis is supported by the fact that there is primary sequence in the *ut*-clause.<sup>67</sup> This possibility of replacing a perfect by a present is of course odd. Presumably the explanation is the same as for *adiūuerit* above: there may have been some morphological confusion because the forms *sīrint* and *sierint* look so similar, and the non-past meaning was extended to the regular forms because they were regarded as equivalent to the extra-paradigmatic forms.

One problematic example from Catullus remains:

(27) (Queen Berenice is addressed.)

Tū uērō, rēgīna, tuēns cum sīdera dīam  
plācābis fēstīs lūminibus Venerem,  
unguinis expertem nōn *sīrīs* esse tuam mē,  
sed potius largīs affice mūneribus. (Catull. 66. 89–92.)

And you, my queen, when you look up to the stars and propitiate divine Venus on festive days, *let* not me, your servant, be without perfume, but rather give me rich gifts.

The manuscript reading is *nōn uestrīs*. *Nōn sīrīs* was suggested by Lachmann. Should it be taken as a prohibition? In that case we should expect the deontic prohibitive *nē*. Perhaps we should follow Scaliger, who reads *nōn sīueris* 'you will not have allowed'; this would be a statement, but could get a deontic interpretation from the context (*futūrum prō imperātīuō*).

<sup>67</sup> Even if we analyse the two examples as prohibitions rather than wishes, the normal forms to substitute for these subjunctives would be present subjunctives, not perfect forms, because we are dealing with the 3rd pers.; see Ch. 4.

If we take all these instances together, it seems that it is easier to regard the special rhotacized forms as belonging to the type *faxō/faxim* than to the type *fēcerō/fēcerim*. This is true not only from a morphological, but also from a functional point of view.

I shall end this section with one last example containing a rhotacized form not yet discussed. It is in a *lēx rēgia* cited by Festus:

(28) In Seruī Tullī (sc. lēgibus) haec est: 'Sī parentem puer *uerberit*, ast olle plōrāssit parēns,<sup>68</sup> puer diuīs parentum sacer estō.' (Fest. p. 260.)

Among the laws of Servius Tullius there is this one: 'If a boy *shall have beaten* his parent, and if that parent shall have cried out, the boy shall be devoted to the deities of his parents for destruction.'

The two conditional clauses with extra-paradigmatic forms are parallel to each other. Both of them function as future perfects anterior to the future imperative *estō*. Since we cannot trust the phonological form in which these laws were transmitted, it is legitimate to assume that the extra-paradigmatic future perfect *uerberit* was still *\*uerbeset* or *\*uerbesit* when the law was introduced, that is, it had not yet undergone rhotacism. The infinitive was probably *\*uerbesi* (> *\*uerbere*).<sup>69</sup>

<sup>68</sup> *Parēns* is almost certainly a gloss on *olle*.

<sup>69</sup> For this verb see Szemerényi (1987b).

## The Sigmatic Infinitives

IN the last two chapters I looked at sigmatic indicatives and subjunctives. However, these are not the only sigmatic forms. There are also sigmatic infinitives, which form the subject of this chapter. No extra-paradigmatic type other than the sigmatic forms has infinitives, and even here there are not many tokens. Plautus has six, four of *impetrāssere* (*Aul.* 687, *Cas.* 271, *Mil.* 1128, *Stich.* 71), and one each of *oppugnāssere* (*Amph.* 210) and *reconciliāssere* (*Capt.* 168). Lucilius has three tokens, all in the same fragment (Lucil. 682–3): *deargentāssere*, *dēpōclāssere*, and *dēspeculāssere*. All these forms occur in AclIs. By contrast, the one token in Pacuvius, *āuerruncāssere*, stands after *possum* (Pacuu. *trag.* 236). In glosses we also find *abiugāssere*, *caperāssere*, *irrūgāssere*, and *occentāssere*, always paraphrased, but never with syntactic context.<sup>1</sup>

All the forms end in *-āssere*, that is, they are derivatives of first-conjugation verbs. There are no tokens of sigmatic infinitives belonging to verbs of other conjugations. Not even *faxō*, the most frequent sigmatic verb form, has an infinitive †*faxere*.<sup>2</sup>

In what follows, I shall look at the productivity and register of these forms and at their time reference and function. This last problem

<sup>1</sup> For *abiugāssere* see Placid. 9. 13 and CGL ii. 3. 41 and iv. 201. 16. For *caperāssere* and *irrūgāssere* see CGL v. 15. 30 and 51. 52. For *occentāssere* see fr. Bob. *gramm.* vii. 544. 29.

<sup>2</sup> Sonnenschein (1891) conjectured †*faxere* for the manuscript reading *facere* in *Rud.* 376, which stands in an Acl with future reference. He did this in order to get rid of the hiatus between *facere* and *hoc*. However, as the present infinitive can stand for the future form, and as there is no other evidence for †*faxere*, it is better to read with Lindsay *sciū lēnōnem facere* <ego> *hoc quod fēcit; saepe dixī*, ‘I knew that the pimp would do what he did; I have said it often.’

is the greater one. In Archaic Latin, both present tense infinitives and future tense infinitives can have future meaning in AcIs, which naturally raises the question to which of the two the sigmatic forms are closer in meaning. Of course this question can only be answered if we know what determines the alternation between present and future infinitives in AcIs with future force. This was the topic of Ch. 5, and the results of that chapter will be important for this one: in Ch. 5 I showed that present infinitives can only have future force if the AcI is telic, but that such present infinitives with future force are relatively frequent in this context, especially if the subjects of the superordinate verb and of the AcI are identical.

## PRODUCTIVITY AND REGISTER

In all Archaic Latin literature, we only find ten tokens of sigmatic infinitives, so they cannot have been productive any more. This becomes even more obvious when we consider that the ten tokens belong to only seven verbs ending in *-āssere*. Plautus still has six such infinitives, while Terence has not preserved a single one.<sup>3</sup>

But even though it is obvious that the sigmatic infinitives are not productive any more, they can still be formed from new verbs:

- (1) (A man is complaining about his wife.)

*Dēpōclāssere* aliquā spērāns me ac *deargentāssere*,  
*dēcalauticāre*, *eburnō speculō dēspeculāssere*. (Lucil. 682–3.)

Hoping that she *will ruin* me in some way *by expenditure on cups* and that she *will deprive* me *of silver*, that she will exact fancy headdress from me, that she *will rob* me of an ivory mirror.

All these denominative first-conjugation base verbs with the privative prefix *dē-* seem to be nonce-formations. The sigmatic forms can be created very easily because first-conjugation verbs normally form their tenses and moods without alterations of the verb stems. The passage is a joke, heightened by these morphological monstrosities.

<sup>3</sup> See also Happ (1967: 89) for the productivity of the sigmatic infinitives and other forms of verbs belonging to the 1st conjugation.

If, like most of the sigmatic indicatives and subjunctives, the sigmatic infinitives belong to a higher register, there is an amusing contrast between the pompous expressions and the trivial content of the lines.

For the remaining forms, higher register is quite likely.<sup>4</sup> The line in Pacuu. *trag.* 236 contains the form *āuerruncāssere*. The verb *āuerruncāre* itself is a religious term, and it seems that Medea is speaking to the king in her function as a priestess.<sup>5</sup> In Plautus, three tokens are in *cantica* and three in *senarii*. In *cantica*, high-register forms are said to occur without obvious reasons; but since there are only six sigmatic infinitives in total, the distribution over different types of verse cannot be helpful. What is more important is that all tokens except *dēpōclāssere* above occur at the end of verses, which is the typical place for some high-register archaisms like the infinitives in *-ier*. Among the tokens in *cantica*, one is in a highly stylized battle report (*Amph.* 210), and one is in a moralizing passage (*Stich.* 71). Of the three passages in *senarii*, one is spoken by a moralizing matron (*Aul.* 687) and one by a slave who, in an elaborate speech, pretends to be disinterested and faithful and to give his master good advice (*Mil.* 1128); the form in the third passage (*Capt.* 168) is not in neutral language either as it is preceded by a number of comic formations like *Pāniceī* ‘inhabitants of Breadtown’. Who is speaking and what text type we are dealing with is much more important than metre, and while the metrical criterion is of no use here, the other two factors show that the sigmatic infinitives belong to a higher register.

## TIME REFERENCE AND FUNCTION

Since the sigmatic infinitives are so rare, it is difficult to reach conclusions about their time reference and function. There is no agreement on these points in the secondary literature. Among the scholars who do not simply say that the forms in *-āssere* are infinitives, without

<sup>4</sup> Christenson (2000: 183) says that the sigmatic infinitives are high-register archaisms, but does not explain why he thinks that the register is elevated.

<sup>5</sup> D’Anna (1967: 219) thinks that she is speaking to her son.

making any remarks about their tense,<sup>6</sup> Neue and Wagener (1897: 521) stand out because they claim that these forms have future perfect meaning.<sup>7</sup> Future perfect infinitives do exist,<sup>8</sup> but the forms in *-āssere* would be the only ones in Latin that are not periphrastic.

The other scholars are divided on this issue: some ascribe present tense meaning to the sigmatic infinitives, others future meaning. *LLF* 621, 624 claims that the future in *-āssō* was regarded as having desiderative and present force and was thus supplemented with an infinitive in *-āssere*. He translates *impetrāssere* as 'to be able to achieve' (*erlangen können*) (624). If this is correct, it is not clear to me how to handle *possum...āuerruncāssere* in Pacuu. *trag.* 236; obviously, 'I can be able to avert' would be odd. However, I do take their statements to mean that the infinitives in *-āssere* are essentially present tense infinitives, albeit with some additional semantic components.

Bennett (1910: 373) regards the forms in *-āssere* as future infinitives: he claims that only future infinitives are found after *cōnfidō* and then cites *Capt.* 167–8, *cōnfidō...mē reconciliāssere*. Similarly, Cannegieter (1896: 27) states that the sigmatic infinitives are future infinitives. The standard dictionaries interpret these forms in the same way: the *OLD* under *oppugnō* claims that the infinitive *oppugnāssere* is a future infinitive. Likewise, L–S 214 under *āuerruncō* say that the form *āuerruncāssere* is a 'very ancient *inf. fut.*' The commentaries also follow this analysis.<sup>9</sup>

All that is clear from these accounts is that the infinitives in *-āssere* do not have past meaning. But should the forms be interpreted as present or as future infinitives? Or is this perhaps a distinction that

<sup>6</sup> In his edition of *Capt.*, Lindsay (1900: 163) states that *reconciliāssere* in l. 168 is an infinitive belonging to the sigmatic aorist, but he does not say anything about the synchronic meaning.

<sup>7</sup> H–S 343 also speak of infinitives of the future perfect, but this seems to be a purely morphological statement intended to set the forms in relation to archaic future perfects like *reconciliāssō*. At any rate, *LLF* 621, 624 believes that these forms were felt to be part of the present system, which makes future perfect meaning impossible.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. *dēceptum fore* (*Stich.* 610).

<sup>9</sup> On *oppugnāssere* or *expugnāssere* in *Amph.* 210 see A. Palmer (1890: 148) and Christenson (2000: 183); on *impetrāssere* in *Aul.* 687 see Stockert (1983: 209); on *impetrāssere* in *Cas.* 271 see MacCary and Willcock (1976: 131); on *impetrāssere* in *Mil.* 1128 see Tyrrell (1927: 211); and on *impetrāssere* in *Stich.* 71 see Petersmann (1973: 104).

does not make sense for them? Since the secondary literature cannot help me here, I must take a fresh look at the few instances I have. I shall begin with the glosses, continue with the forms in ACIs, and then examine the one form (*āuerruncāssere*) dependent on *posse*. It is only after this that I can discuss the tense of the *-āssere* forms.

### The Forms in the Glosses

Our glosses date from the fifth or sixth century AD, and some belong to even later compilations. The sigmatic infinitives are paraphrased with either the Greek aorist infinitive or the Latin present infinitive:

(2) *Abiugāssere* ἀποζεύξαι. (CGL ii. 3. 41.)

*Abiugāssere* ‘to separate’.

(3) *Caperāssere* *inrūgāssere* contrahī. (CGL v. 15. 30.)

*Caperāssere* and *inrūgāssere* ‘to become wrinkled’.

In Ex. 2, the Latin sigmatic infinitive is glossed as a Greek aorist infinitive. The Greek aorist infinitive does not differ from its present counterpart in time reference, but there are aspectual distinctions. It is noticeable that the Latin form has not been paraphrased with a Greek future infinitive.<sup>10</sup> In Ex. 3, the two sigmatic infinitives are not rendered as a Latin future infinitive either, but as a present infinitive.

Since the glosses are so late, their value must remain unclear. It is possible that the forms were paraphrased not so much because of their endings as because of their lexical meanings. In that case, the fact that the forms are glossed as present infinitives may not be significant at all. Besides, there is even the danger that some of them are made up; if someone reads *quī malum carmen incantāssit* and understands the content, but not the morphology, he might create an infinitive *incantāssere* and gloss it. However, this risk is not too great because many forms which are paraphrased are finite verb forms or oblique cases of nouns. This means that the people writing glosses were not likely to change the forms they were commenting on. Nevertheless, the glosses can only supplement the other evidence, but they cannot have the same value.

<sup>10</sup> I am assuming that the form is not a textual corruption of a future infinitive.

The AcIs with *-āssere*-Infinitives

All the AcIs with *-āssere* forms in Plautus and Lucilius have future time reference:

(4) (Lysidamus and his wife each have a favourite candidate for marrying a slave girl. Lysidamus thinks that he can persuade his wife's candidate to give up.)

Quid si ego autem ab armigero impetrō  
 ěām illī permittāt? Atquē hoc *crēdo impetrāssere*. (Cas. 270–1.)

But what if I obtain it from the armour-bearer that he gives her up to him?  
 And this I *believe* I *shall obtain*.

*Impetrāssere* must have future reference because Lysidamus has not yet even started talking to his wife's candidate. All the other tokens of AcIs with sigmatic forms have future reference as well. Thus one's first reaction is to regard them as future infinitives. However, we saw in Ch. 5 that the present infinitive is also allowed in such contexts. As I showed in that chapter, present infinitives with future force are more or less restricted to telic AcIs, but among such AcIs they are quite frequent, particularly if the subjects of the superordinate verb and of the AcI are identical; both conditions are met here. Therefore, it is possible that *impetrāssere* is a present infinitive. We must try to find out which interpretation is more likely, or if the sigmatic infinitives should in fact be taken in an altogether different way. Does it help to look at what other infinitives the sigmatic forms are co-ordinated with? In Ex. 5 an AcI with a sigmatic infinitive is parallel to other AcIs:

(5) (A slave tells how Amphitruo sent envoys to the Teloboians.)

Eōs lēgāt, Tēloboīs iubēt sententiam ut *dīcant* suam:  
 sī sine ui et sine bellō uelint rapta et raptōrēs trādere,  
 sī quae asportāssent redderē,<sup>11</sup> *se exercitum extemplō domum  
 reductūrum, abitūrōs agrō Argiūōs, pācem atque ōtium  
 dare illis; sīn aliter sient animātī neque dent quae petāt,*

<sup>11</sup> The final syllable counts as heavy before the medial diaeresis. In the next line, there is a hiatus in the same position. (See Cruttenden 1997: 33 for the lengthening of final syllables in English intonation groups.)

*sēse igitur summā uī uirīsq̄e eōrum oppidum oppugnāssere.*  
(*Amph.* 205–10.)

He sends them as envoys and orders them to *tell* the Teloboians his terms: if they should want to hand over the pillage and the pillagers without violence and war, and if they should want to return what they had taken away, *he will lead* his army *back* home immediately, and the *Argives will leave* their territory, and they *give* them peace and quiet; but if they should be otherwise disposed and should not give him what he demands, he *will* then *attack*/he then *attacks* their city with greatest force and with his men.

The Teloboians have two alternatives; depending on which one they choose, Amphitruo will either leave peacefully or punish them. The two alternatives are presented in the conditional clauses in the present subjunctive. Amphitruo's subsequent reactions are set out in the ACIs dependent on the verb *dicant*. As none of Amphitruo's actions has begun yet, all the ACIs must have future reference. The reaction to the first alternative is expressed in three ACIs, two of which have future infinitives (*redductūrum* and *abitūrōs*), while the third contains a present infinitive (*dare*). Amphitruo's reaction to the second alternative is expressed in an ACI with a sigmatic infinitive. The parallelism is neat: conditional clauses with *sī*—ACIs—conditional clause with *sīn*—ACI. However, it cannot tell us much. The reason is that in the ACIs that precede there are infinitives that belong to either tense, the future and the present.

There are no other instances of this kind of parallelism, but Lucilius (Ex. 1 above) has co-ordination between sigmatic and non-sigmatic forms, which is probably more important than mere parallelism. The present infinitive *dēcalauticāre* and the three sigmatic infinitives *dēpōclāssere*, *deargentāssere*, and *dēspeculāssere* all depend on the same participle *spērāns* and have the same future reference. This could suggest that the sigmatic infinitives can be used as special forms of the present infinitive, like *dēcalauticāre*, with which they are co-ordinated. But, as Ex. 5 above shows, the co-ordination would not be surprising either if the forms in *-āssere* were future infinitives.

To summarize, the few ACIs with sigmatic infinitives all have future reference. But it is difficult to tell whether this means that they have to be interpreted as future infinitives like *impetrātūrum*, or whether they can be regarded as present infinitives with future reference. Can the one token after *posse* help us in this respect?

*Āuerruncāssere after posse*

We have one form in *-āssere* from Pacuvius. It occurs after the verb *posse*. Do we have to interpret it as an alternative present infinitive, or could we regard it as a future infinitive? The infinitives after *posse* can have different tenses, but the present infinitive is most frequent:

(6) (Sosia is afraid.)

Neque miser mē *commouēre possum* prae formīdine. (*Amph.* 337.)

I cannot *move* for fear, poor chap that I am.

Here *posse* means ‘can/be able to’, that is, it expresses root modality.<sup>12</sup> In this meaning, *posse* can only have present tense infinitives or their equivalents. In Plautus, there are two tokens of *posse* ‘to be able to’ with perfect infinitives that function as present tense forms:

(7) (Charinus’ friend Eutychus is still not back.)

Sed tamendem sī podagrōsīs pedibus essēt Eutychus,  
iam ā portū *rediisse potuit*. (*Merc.* 595–6.)

But still, even if Eutychus had gouty feet, he *could have returned* from the harbour by now.

(8) (Lyconides is not convinced that his slave has only made a joke; he thinks he has been serious.)

Nōn potes *probāsse* nūgās. (*Aul.* 828.)

You cannot *win approval* for your frivolities.

These two cases are different from each other.<sup>13</sup> In Ex. 7, the perfect infinitive does not express a past action, which would be impossible, but indicates the present result of a past action. *Ā portū rediisse*, ‘to have returned from the harbour’, equals *hīc esse*, ‘to be here’. The perfect infinitive denoting a present result is temporally

<sup>12</sup> For modality in general see F. R. Palmer (1986). Dik (1997: i. 241–3 and 295–6) can serve as a first introduction. According to Dik (1997: i. 241), root modality concerns the ability or willingness of an agent to carry out the action expressed by the verb.

<sup>13</sup> Bennett (1910: 428) lists them next to each other as if there were no difference. But cf. the analysis in *TLL* x. 2 fasc. ii (1982: 155, ll. 52–62). *Merc.* 596 is cited under the ‘exempla indicantia actionis absolutionem’, while *Aul.* 828 is the only example before 100 BC of ‘neglecta congruentia temporum’.

equivalent to a present infinitive, which can also be seen from the fact that such a perfect infinitive takes the primary sequence of tenses.<sup>14</sup>

Ex. 8 is different: here *posse* does denote ability, but the perfect infinitive does not express a present result. The translation ‘you are able to have won approval’ does not make any sense. Unlike Madvig (1887: 496–7), I do not think that this is simply a careless translation of a Greek aorist infinitive; nor do I think that this is a manuscript error for †*probāssere*.<sup>15</sup> Rather, this usage, which is rare in classical prose,<sup>16</sup> is a phenomenon that can be found after *uelle* and some other verbs in Plautus, Terence, and contemporary inscriptions such as the *senātūs cōnsultum dē Bacchānālībus* (CIL i<sup>2</sup>. 581; cf. *nē quis . . . Bacānāl habuisse uelēt*, ‘let no one . . . wish to have a festival of Bacchus’). It also survives in non-literary sources of a later date; see Adams and Mayer (1999b: 8) for *fēcisse* with future reference in a letter from Vindolanda written by someone who also uses the substandard forms *habunt* (= *habent*) and *rediēmus* (= *redībimus*). But on the whole I agree with Pinkster (1990: 236), who says: ‘There are so few instances that are not consciously literary, that they are useless as a (partial) basis for an aspectual theory.’ The above token from the *senātūs cōnsultum dē Bacchānālībus* is not Hellenizing, see Coleman (1975: 133).

While both present and perfect infinitives exist after *posse* in the meaning ‘to be able to’, the future infinitive does not occur. The most natural explanation is that in *possum rīdēre*, ‘I am able to laugh’, the ability can hardly be restricted to the present, but is regarded as extending into the future as well. If the ability is restricted to the future, *poterō rīdēre* ‘I shall be able to laugh’ is used. *Possum rīsūrus esse* ‘I am able to be about to laugh’ is semantically odd and thus excluded.

Yet *posse* can also have the meaning ‘to be possible that’, in which case it expresses epistemic modality and could be argued to take

<sup>14</sup> See Ch. 3.

<sup>15</sup> A parallel would be CGL v. 51. 21, where *caperāsse* stands for *caperāssere*. In our passage, however, †*probāssere* would violate the law of Hermann and Lachmann (see Questa 1967: 129–31).

<sup>16</sup> See, however, Önnertfors (1956: 63) for Pliny the Elder.

a *nōminātīuus cum īnfīnītūō* (NcI).<sup>17</sup> NcIs are most commonly associated with passive verbs of speech and are not restricted to any tense. They can have posterior infinitives:

(9) (Cicero is speaking about gladiators in Capua.)

*Ēruptionem factūrī fuisse dicēbantur.*<sup>18</sup> (Cic. Att. 7. 14. 2.)

They are said to have been going to break out.

In Ex. 9, the past prospective infinitive could be replaced by a present or a past infinitive without the sentence's becoming ungrammatical. In Ex. 10, the NcI depends on *posse* and has a perfect infinitive with true past meaning:

(10) (Hypsipyle is complaining that Jason did not come back, but says it might not be his fault.)

*Cum cuperēs, uentōs nōn habuisse potes.* (Ou. epist. 6. 6.)

Even though you might have wanted to, *it is possible that you did not have* good winds/you *may not have had* good winds.

Here the translation 'you are able to have had' would not make sense. What is at stake is not the addressee's ability, but the possibility that something has happened. The addressee's ability cannot extend into the past, while possibility can.

The NcI is a construction that transformational grammarians would call 'subject-to-subject raising'. There are two propositions, a superordinate one ('it is possible') and a subordinate one ('you have not had good winds'). In the transformational account, the subject of the subordinated proposition becomes the subject of the superordinated one ('raising'): *it is possible that you have not had good winds* → (lit.) *you are possible not to have had good winds*.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>17</sup> On the NcI in general see Pinkster (1990: 130–1). On raising with Latin modal verbs see Bolkestein (1980: 49–57). On *posse* see TLL x. 2 fasc. i (1980: 133, ll. 51–2): 'structura personali fere inuita non significatur tam facultas subiecti quam *possibile esse*, quod *tota sententia* indicatum est.' On epistemic modality see Dik (1997: i. 242).

<sup>18</sup> *Dicēbantur* is an epistolary imperfect.

<sup>19</sup> It is perhaps not very desirable to derive the NcI transformationally, at least from a synchronic perspective. In the case of *posse* + NcI, there is no *posse* + AcI from which it could be derived; *potest ut* 'it is possible' (cf. Ex. 13 below) with its *ut*-clause can hardly be taken as the starting-point. Diachronically, the NcI after *dicitur* and other passive verbs did presumably start by passivizing *dicunt* + AcI. But synchronically there are pragmatic differences between AcI and NcI.

The latter construction is ungrammatical with ‘to be possible’ in English, but it works in both English and Latin with ‘to be said to’:

(11) (a) *It is said that the friends have come.* → *The friends are said to have come.*

(b) *Dīcitur amīcōs uēnisse.* → *Amīcī dīcuntur uēnisse.*

Bennett (1910: 389) states for Archaic Latin that ‘except with *dicor* and *videor* the construction Nominativus cum Infinitivo is rare; with *videor* it occurs with great frequency, as it does in the classical period.’ His list contains only the NcIs after passive verbs. He does not even mention the NcI after *posse* ‘to be possible’, presumably because it is not a passive verb or because it is only attested with present infinitives, which means that its surface structure does not differ from that of *posse* ‘to be able to’. Ex. 12 is an Archaic Latin example of *posse* ‘to be possible’ with the NcI:

(12) (Theopropides has been persuaded by a young man to forgive his son.)

*Nōn potuit uenīre ōrātōr magis ad me impetrābilis  
quam tū. (Most. 1162–3.)*

A more persuasive spokesman than you *couldn’t have come* to me. (transl. Nixon 1924: iii. 413)

Here *posse* cannot denote ability. If it did, the meaning would be ‘there was a more persuasive spokesman than you, but he was not able to come’. This is obviously not the case. The true meaning is ‘there is no spokesman who is as persuasive as you, so it would not have been possible that any such person came’. *Posse* marks possibility. ‘It is not possible that *x* comes’ becomes (lit.) ‘*x* is not possible to come’.

Alternatively, *posse* in the meaning ‘it is possible that’ can take an *ut*-clause:

(13) (Pseudolus has claimed to be trustworthy, but Harpax does not trust him.)

*Potēst ut alii ita arbitrentur et ego ut nē crēdam tibi. (Pseud. 633.)*

*It is possible that* others think so and *that* I do *not* believe you.

Here *potest* means ‘it is possible’ and takes an *ut*-clause and an *ut nē*-clause.

I can finally come to the token with the sigmatic infinitive. It is from Pacuvius' tragedy *Medus*:

(14) *Possum ego istam capite clādem āuerruncāssere.* (Pacuu. *trag.* 236.)

(a) *I can avert* that disaster from your person.

(b) *It is possible that I shall avert* that disaster from your person.

Which translation is correct? The NCl with tenses other than the present is not yet attested after *posse* in Archaic Latin, but would it be impossible? This is difficult to tell. We have to rely on other criteria. Translation (a) seems to be confirmed by the story itself, insofar as it can be reconstructed. We only have a number of fragments of Pacuvius' *Medus*. Nevertheless, it is not unreasonable to assume that the version we find in Hyg. *fab.* 27. 56 is essentially the same as that in Pacuvius. It is quite complicated.

Aeetes and Perses are brothers, but enemies. Medea, Aeetes' daughter, has a son, Medus, by King Aegeus of Athens. She had murdered Creon, the king of Corinth, whose son is Hippotes. At the moment, Medea is back home in Colchis, but as she fears recognition by King Perses, she pretends to be a priestess of Diana. Perses had been warned by an oracle to be on his guard against Aeetes' descendants. Medus is looking for his mother and is stranded on the coast of Colchis. In order to be safe, he pretends to be not Medus, but Hippotes. Perses imprisons him nevertheless. When Medea hears that Hippotes has come, she fears for her life and invents a plan: she goes to Perses and claims that his prisoner is not Hippotes, but Medus, and that she will kill him in order to avert the danger to Perses. When she sees Medus, she realizes that she has unwittingly spoken the truth, and Medus and Medea recognize each other. Medus takes Medea's sword, kills Perses, and becomes king; he calls his kingdom Media.

Warmington (1936: 257) attributes the fragment to Medea speaking to Perses; this is indeed the most likely place in the play. It seems less likely that it comes from the scene in which Medea is talking to her son.<sup>20</sup>

In either case the interpretation 'it is possible that I shall avert' is unlikely. Whether Medea is reassuring Perses or her son, such a half-hearted statement would be inappropriate. In fact, this would

<sup>20</sup> This is the stance taken by D'Anna (1967: 219).

never be Medea's style, irrespective of circumstances. We need the interpretation 'I can avert'.

Thus for both linguistic and literary reasons the sigmatic form in Pacuvius is best interpreted as dependent on *posse* in its meaning 'to be able'. Here future infinitives are not allowed, and *āuerruncāssere* must be interpreted as a present infinitive.

### The Tense of the Sigmatic Infinitives

In Classical Latin, there is a clear correlation between time reference and the tenses of infinitives in AcIs. Posteriority is almost exclusively expressed by future infinitives, while for simultaneity there are the present infinitives. But as I showed in Ch. 5, in Archaic Latin the tense of an infinitive does not always determine its time reference. The future infinitive is only used for posterior events, as in Classical Latin, whereas the present infinitive can be employed not only for simultaneous events, but also for posterior ones.

The sigmatic infinitives always have future reference in AcIs. This can be interpreted in two ways: either they fit in the same semantic or syntactic slot as the future infinitives, or they fit in that of the present (= non-past) infinitives, in which case the absence of *-āssere* forms in AcIs with present reference would be due to chance. The one sigmatic infinitive in Archaic Latin that is not in an AcI is in Pacuvius. It depends on *possum* and, from a syntactic point of view, could only be replaced by a present infinitive, but not by a future form. Thus one could be tempted to argue that the sigmatic infinitives in the AcIs belong with the present (= non-past) infinitives and that the lack of *-āssere* forms with present reference is fortuitous.

But can this be correct? There are six AcIs with sigmatic forms in Plautus and one in Lucilius, which, however, contains three sigmatic infinitives. We cannot really take the forms in Lucilius into account because he uses them in order to make a joke. But, given the six sigmatic infinitives in Plautus, how likely would it be that all of them have future reference if the *-āssere* forms functioned like present infinitives?

In Ch. 5 I identified two main factors which, in Archaic Latin, facilitate the use of present infinitives in contexts where future infinitives would be expected. If the infinitives are telic and have the same subjects as the superordinate verbs, present infinitives are far more likely to have future reference than if these conditions are not met.<sup>21</sup> All six sigmatic infinitives in Plautus are telic, and five of them have the same subjects as their superordinate verbs.<sup>22</sup> What are the chances that six randomly chosen, regular present infinitives in AclIs all have future reference if they are telic and have the same subjects as the superordinate verbs? There are 79 such infinitives in Plautus and Terence.<sup>23</sup> 77.22% of these infinitives (61 tokens) have future reference. The chances that six randomly chosen present infinitives of this type all have present reference is 77.22% to the power of six, that is 21.20%. In other words, if we take six such present infinitives in AclIs, we stand a one-in-five chance that all of them have future reference; this is possible, but not highly likely.

Can the forms in *-āssere* be equivalent to regular present infinitives? The chances for this to be true are around 20% at best; I say at best because among the six tokens there is a different-subject verb.<sup>24</sup> Because of the one Pacuvian token of *āuerruncāssere* after *possum*, where future infinitives could not occur, we should consider this as a possibility. However, it is also conceivable that the *-āssere* forms started as future infinitives proper and that Pacuvius did no longer

<sup>21</sup> Another factor might be metre, but that should not be overestimated. The lines could easily be rewritten. *Mil.* 1128 reads *Cupio hercle.—Crēdō tē facile impetrāssere*. Plautus could also have written *Cupio hercle.—Facile te impetrātūrū putō*.

<sup>22</sup> The exception is in *Mil.* 1128. *Stich.* 71 is not really an exception: the superordinate verb is in the 1st pers. sg., while the infinitive has a 1st-pers. pl. subject. In *Amph.* 210, Amphytruo is speaking through his envoys, so this is no exception either.

<sup>23</sup> The figures do not change much if we leave out Terence. Table 5.5 shows that there are 61 telic present infinitives with same subjects and future meaning. There are 18 telic tokens with same subjects and present meaning; they are not in the tables of Ch. 5.

<sup>24</sup> If the sigmatic infinitives behaved like the majority of regular present infinitives, the chances would be lower because one of the sigmatic infinitives has a different subject. However, for *dare* the present with future force is frequent regardless of whether the subjects are the same or not. Since *dare* did not follow the pattern of the other verbs here, the sigmatic forms might not have done so either.

know how to use them. If so, he employed *āuerruncāssere* as a high-register form, but with ‘incorrect’ tense features. Such indiscriminate use of archaisms—and forms in *-āssere* were certainly archaisms in Pacuvius’ time—has parallels elsewhere in Pacuvius:

(15) (Cicero is quoting lines from Pacuvius’ Chryses to show the over-use of gen. pl. in *-um*.)

... cōnsilium socii, augurium atque extum interpretēs. ...

Postquam prōdigium horriferum, portentum pauōs ...

(Cic. *orat.* 155 = Pacuu. *trag.* 81–2.)

... partners of counsels, interpreters of auguries and entrails. ... After the fear of horrifying signs and omens ...

As far as we can judge from Plautus, the genitive plural in *-um* instead of *-ōrum* is already an archaism around 200 BC, except for genitives like *nummum*, where *-um* has been lexicalized.<sup>25</sup> Excessive use of such archaisms, even where they do not seem to be appropriate, is typical of the *tragicus tumor*.<sup>26</sup>

## CONCLUSIONS

The infinitives in *-āssere* are fossilized forms belonging to a higher register. The few tokens are all telic. In ACIs they have future reference, but the one token after *posse* functions like a present infinitive. In Archaic Latin, the present infinitive can have present or future reference. My data are insufficient to decide between two interpretations: *-āssere*-infinitives could be equivalent to present tense infinitives or

<sup>25</sup> See Gerschner (2002: 77–80), who also discusses the use of this gen. in the *genus grande*.

<sup>26</sup> For false archaisms in Latin orthography see H–S, *allgemeiner Teil*, 54–5. For the wrong use of *ast* in Cicero see Powell (2005: 136–7). For the sigmatic future *inuolāsit* employed as a past tense see Adams, Lapidge, and Reinhardt (2005: 15) and Ch. 12. In Homeric Greek, we find the old instrumental ending *-φι* in new functions (gen. etc.). Similarly, by analogy to *ὄρεϊ νυφόμεντι* (with *ὄρεϊ* scanning as an anapaest because the second word comes from *\*snip<sup>h</sup>owenti*) other words beginning with a simple nasal can make position. See West (1997) and Horrocks (1997) for more data. In dying languages salient features are also often overgeneralized by semi-speakers; see Campbell and Muntzel (1989: 188–9) on glottalization in Jumaytepeque Xinca, a Mayan language.

to future infinitives, in which case the token after *possum* is a syntactically false archaism.

My own feeling is that the sigmatic infinitives are future infinitives and that Pacuvius introduced a false archaism into his tragedy *Medus*. However, in the absence of more data it is impossible to substantiate this feeling, and others may have different intuitions about these forms.

## The Type *duim* in Archaic Latin

SCHOLARS have always been mystified by forms like *duim* and *duīs*, which seem to belong to *dare*, but, unlike the regular forms, contain the vowel *-u-*. In fact, a strong indication that *duim* (as well as *duam*, see Ch. 10) functions as a special form of *dare* and not as a different verb is that it does not form a complete paradigm. Moreover, the constructions of *duim* and of the regular forms of *dare* do not differ. In *Aul.* 62 we even find *uerba...duīt* instead of *verba dēt*; given that *uerba dare* ‘fool someone’ is an idiomatic phrase, the fact that *duīt* can replace *dēt* here is a clear sign that the two are forms of the same verb. The *u*-forms alternate with forms without *-u-*, compare *Aul.* 238: *nihil est...quod dem.—Nē duās*, ‘there is nothing... which I could give.—Don’t give.’ This alternation points in the same direction, namely that *duās* belongs to *dare* just as *dem* does. There are a number of similar examples.<sup>1</sup> Not all of them show equally well that the forms with and without *-u-* belong to the same verbs, but when taken together, the examples do not leave many doubts about it.

Whereas most discussions have concentrated on etymology, I shall continue along the lines of Chs. 6, 7, and 8 and look at the semantics of the extra-paradigmatic *ī*-subjunctives of the type *duim* in Archaic Latin.<sup>2</sup> I shall not examine forms like *siem/sim*, *uelim*, *nōlim*, *māuelim/mālim*, or *edim*: even though they are morphologically

<sup>1</sup> Cf. for *concrēdere*: *Aul.* 581 + 585; for *crēdere*: *Trin.* 606–7, *Phorm.* 993 + 996–7; for *dare*: *Asin.* 457 + 460–1, *Capt.* 945 + 947, *Merc.* 400–2, *Pseud.* 936–7, *Vid.* 84–5, *Phorm.* 974 + 976; for *perdere*: *Aul.* 785–6, *Curc.* 720 + 724, *Poen.* 863–5, *Haut.* 811 + 814; for *perīre* (*perīre* normally substitutes for the passive of *perdere*): *Merc.* 709–10, *Merc.* 792–3, *Hec.* 133–4.

<sup>2</sup> My collection of forms is based on my own reading and a search in which I used the *BTL* and Neue and Wagoner (1897: 309–16), who also list subjunctives like *ēdim*.

‘irregular’, it is clear that semantically they function like other present subjunctives; in the paradigms of their respective verbs they are the only forms to occupy the present subjunctive slot. This is not true of *dare*, which has *duim* in addition to regular forms of all tenses. We are now left with the *ī*-subjunctives of *dare* itself and some of its compounds, namely *addere*, *crēdere*, *interdare*, and *perdere*. From a diachronic perspective, we are dealing with two separate roots here: *dare* belongs to *\*deH<sub>3</sub>-* ‘give’ like Greek δί-δω-μι and Sanskrit *da-dā-mi*, whereas *crēdere* is a compound of *\*d<sup>h</sup>eH<sub>1</sub>-* ‘put’, compare Greek τί-θη-μι and Sanskrit *da-d<sup>h</sup>ā-mi*.<sup>3</sup> In this chapter, however, I shall not worry about this distinction because the roots merged in compounds in the history of Latin, and forms with *-u-* exist for both types. *ī*-subjunctives of all these verbs occur in Plautus, whereas only *dare* and *perdere* have them in Terence.

The forms of *dare* look as follows: *duim*, *duīs*, *duīt*, *duīmus*, *duītis*, and *duint*. Plautus has 40 *ī*-subjunctives of *dare* and its compounds, Terence has 9. Outside Plautus and Terence, there are not many tokens in Archaic Latin: the subjunctive *duīs* can be found once each in Pacuu. *trag.* 219 and in Cato *agr.* 141. 3, and Turpil. *com.* 102 has one instance of *perduint*. There may in addition be a passive subjunctive form *duītur* in the Twelve Tables (Lex XII tab. ap. Plin. *nat.* 21. 7), but the reading is uncertain. The few indicative forms like *concrēduō* (Aul. 585) or *interduō* (Plaut. *fab. inc. fr.* 2) will be discussed at the end of this chapter.

We can contrast these forms with the regular subjunctives of *dare* and all its compounds. There are 405 relevant subjunctives in Plautus and 120 in Terence. If we add the numbers of the *ī*-forms and then calculate the percentages of *ī*-subjunctives of this total, we get their relative frequency among *dare* and its compounds. It is 8.99% for Plautus and 6.98% for Terence.<sup>4</sup> While these figures do not speak for

<sup>3</sup> Both roots are telic and form root aorists in Indo-European. In Latin, the verbs in question are not always telic: *crēdere* in its meaning ‘believe’ is atelic. For the concept of telicity see Ch. 5.

<sup>4</sup> If we merely compare the *ī*-subjunctives with the regular subjunctives of *dare* and those of its compounds that have such *ī*-forms in Plautus and Terence, the figures do not change greatly. These five verbs have 337 regular subjunctives in Plautus and 107 in Terence. If we add up the *ī*-forms and these subjunctives and then calculate the percentages of *ī*-subjunctives, we get 10.61% for Plautus and 7.76% for Terence.

great productivity, there does not seem to be any significant decline between the two authors either.

The questions I am asking about the  $\bar{i}$ -subjunctives are to a large extent the same as those I was interested in when discussing the sigmatic subjunctives in Ch. 7:

1. The forms do not seem to be very productive, but are there differences in usage between main and subordinate clauses, or between *dare* and its various compounds?
2. Since the  $\bar{i}$ -subjunctives are dying out, are they restricted to particular registers?
3. With what forms do *duim* etc. alternate, and what are their temporal and aspectual functions?
4. Are there any contexts in which  $\bar{i}$ -forms are particularly frequent or particularly rare?
5. What does *du-* go back to? Is it an aorist or a present stem, and how can the *-u-* be explained?

I shall examine questions 1–4 in the next sections, but postpone question 5 for Ch. 11. The first and fourth sections require statistical comparisons between  $\bar{i}$ -forms and regular subjunctives. As such analyses are only possible with large corpora, I have exclusively used data from Plautus and Terence in the tables in these two sections.

## FREQUENCY AND PRODUCTIVITY

In this section, I examine contrasts in frequency between  $\bar{i}$ -forms and regular subjunctives of the same verbs in Plautus and Terence. There are five verbs in these two authors that have extra-paradigmatic  $\bar{i}$ -subjunctives: *addere*, *crēdere*, *dare*, *interdare*, and *perdere*. Like the other extra-paradigmatic subjunctives discussed so far, the sigmatic subjunctives in Ch. 7, the  $\bar{i}$ -forms are more frequent in main than in subordinate clauses, while the opposite is true of the regular forms. 85% of the  $\bar{i}$ -subjunctives in Plautus (34 out of 40 tokens) occur in main clauses, while it is only 29.43% of the regular subjunctives of

TABLE 9.1. The proportion of *ī*-forms in main and subordinate clauses

|                             | <i>ī</i> -subjunctives | Regular subjunctives | <i>ī</i> -subjunctives (%) |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|
| Main clauses Plautus        | 34                     | 98                   | 25.76                      |
| Main clauses Terence        | 8                      | 27                   | 22.86                      |
| Subordinate clauses Plautus | 6                      | 235                  | 2.49                       |
| Subordinate clauses Terence | 1                      | 79                   | 1.25                       |

*Note:* Again, I did not consider the four regular tokens that are ambiguous between main and subordinate clauses (3 of them are in Plautus).

the same five verbs in Plautus (98 out of 333 tokens).<sup>5</sup> The figures are similar for Terence: 88.89% of *ī*-forms can be found in main clauses (8 out of 9 tokens), but it is only 25.47% of the regular subjunctives (27 out of 106 tokens).<sup>6</sup>

Consequently the *ī*-subjunctives have survived better in main than in subordinate clauses, and one must look at the two clause types separately. The contrast in productivity between the *ī*-forms in main clauses and the *ī*-forms in subordinate clauses can be made even more obvious: I have calculated what percentages the *ī*-forms make up of the subjunctives in main and subordinate clauses. The results for the five relevant verbs, *dare*, *addere*, *crēdere*, *interdare*, and *perdere*, are presented in Table 9.1.

As can be seen, slightly more than a quarter of the tokens in Plautine main clauses are extra-paradigmatic forms, and the figure is not much lower in Terence; by contrast, in subordinate clauses the percentage of *ī*-forms is below 3% in Plautus and below 2% in Terence.<sup>7</sup> The *ī*-forms are a real presence in main clauses in both authors, but virtually absent in the subordinate ones. This is not too surprising: in main clauses, subjunctives have more ‘meaning’ than in subordinate ones. In main clauses, there is normally a choice between the factual indicative and the less factual subjunctive, which is used for wishes, prohibitions, etc. In subordinate clauses, on the other hand, subjunctives tend to be mere markers of subordination. Often

<sup>5</sup> There are 336, not 333 tokens, but I leave out the three that are ambiguous between main and subordinate clauses.

<sup>6</sup> There are not 106 tokens, but 107; I ignore the one that is ambiguous between a main and a subordinate clause.

<sup>7</sup> The likelihood that these findings are statistically significant is higher than 99.95%, as can be demonstrated with a t-test.

TABLE 9.2. The distribution of *ī*-forms and regular subjunctives in Plautus: verbs

|                  | <i>ī</i> -subjunctives | Regular subjunctives | Total | <i>ī</i> -forms (%) |
|------------------|------------------------|----------------------|-------|---------------------|
| <i>addere</i>    | 1                      | 7                    | 8     | 12.5                |
| <i>crēdere</i>   | 3                      | 67                   | 70    | 4.29                |
| <i>dare</i>      | 14                     | 202                  | 216   | 6.48                |
| <i>interdare</i> | 2                      | 0                    | 2     | 100                 |
| <i>perdere</i>   | 20                     | 60                   | 80    | 25                  |
| Total            | 40                     | 336                  | 376   | 10.64               |

the subordinator demands the subjunctive, so there is not always an opposition between the moods and the subjunctive cannot contribute much to the meaning. As the use of obsolescent forms tends to be a conscious decision, they are more likely to occur in contexts where they are meaningful, that is, in main clauses.

One might wonder whether the *ī*-forms are distributed equally over the five verbs in Plautus. In order to find out, I have calculated the percentages of the *ī*-forms versus the regular subjunctives for every verb. The results are outlined in Table 9.2.

The 40 *ī*-subjunctives have 336 regular counterparts in total. This gives us 10.64% and 89.36%, respectively. If all five verbs had equally productive *ī*-forms, the distribution would be the same for all of them. Only *addere* is distributed according to this ratio, but there are merely eight tokens, one with *-ī-* and seven regular forms. This means that the distribution may be due to chance. Similarly, there are only two tokens of *interduim*, so the absence of regular forms could be fortuitous as well.<sup>8</sup> *Perdere* has disproportionately many *ī*-forms (25% of all subjunctives rather than 10.64%), while *crēdere* and *dare* have fewer forms. On the other hand, *perdere* does not have any extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctives, while *crēdere* has five of them in Plautus; *dare* has merely two. This points to a certain lexicalization: when *perdere* takes an extra-paradigmatic subjunctive, it will be an *ī*-form; in the case of *dare*, it is normally an *ī*-form (fourteen *ī*-forms versus two irregular *ā*-forms), while for *crēdere* it may be either *-ī-* or *-ā-* (three *ī*-forms versus five extra-paradigmatic *ā*-forms). As I

<sup>8</sup> Especially since this verb is rare; the only other irregular form is Plautus' *interduō*, and regular forms are not attested at all in Archaic Latin. In fact, regular forms of this verb may have been created late by analogy.

argued elsewhere (de Melo 2004a), this variation between  $\bar{i}$ - and  $\bar{a}$ - is not coupled with any functional differences.

In Terence, the only  $\bar{i}$ -forms that survive belong to *perdere* and *dare*. In Plautus, *perdere* has an unusually high number of  $\bar{i}$ -subjunctives both in absolute numbers and when compared with the regular subjunctives, so the survival of these forms in Terence is not surprising. By contrast, in Plautus the number of  $\bar{i}$ -forms of *dare* is small in comparison with the number of regular subjunctives, which does not speak for great productivity among the extra-paradigmatic forms. So why do forms like *duint* survive in Terence? Even though in Plautus the  $\bar{i}$ -subjunctives of *dare* may not have been as productive as those of *perdere*, their absolute frequency was still fairly high because *dare* itself is a frequent verb. Thus the survival of forms like *duint* in Terence is not unexpected.

There are sixteen compounds of *dare* in Plautus that do not have  $\bar{i}$ -subjunctives. Is this absence of  $\bar{i}$ -forms due to chance? *Abdere*, *circumdare*, *didere*, *ēdere*, *obdere*, and *prōdere* have no subjunctives at all, and *apscondere* and *subdere* have one subjunctive each; because these verbs are so rare, it is impossible to know whether the lack of  $\bar{i}$ -subjunctives is coincidental or whether these verbs could not form any. Among the remaining compounds of *dare*, *reddere* is the most frequent. It has 36 regular subjunctives in Plautus. If it had  $\bar{i}$ -forms beside it which were as productive as those of the five verbs in Table 9.2, I should expect four or five tokens next to the 36 regular forms in Plautus.<sup>9</sup> Their non-existence can hardly be fortuitous. Thus it is likely that *reddere* simply cannot form  $\bar{i}$ -subjunctives in Plautine Latin. *Accrēdere* does have extra-paradigmatic subjunctives—there is one extra-paradigmatic  $\bar{a}$ -form next to one regular subjunctive; however, it is unclear whether it could also have  $\bar{i}$ -subjunctives. *Vendere* has fifteen regular subjunctives. If it had  $\bar{i}$ -subjunctives, and if the percentages of  $\bar{i}$ -forms and regular subjunctives were 10.64% and 89.36% as above, I should expect there to be one or two (1.79)  $\bar{i}$ -tokens. Their absence may be coincidental. The remaining five compounds are *concrēdere*, *condere*, *dēdere*, *indere*, and *recondere*. Together, they

<sup>9</sup> The percentages I calculated in Table 9.2 are 10.64% of  $\bar{i}$ -forms and 89.36% of regular subjunctives. If the 36 regular subjunctives of *reddere* amounted to 89.36% of a total consisting of regular subjunctives and  $\bar{i}$ -forms, there should be 4.28  $\bar{i}$ -forms, i.e. four or five tokens.

have fifteen regular subjunctives, just as many as *uendere* on its own. Again, the lack of *ī*-forms could be due to chance.

The compounds in Terence that do not have *ī*-forms but regular subjunctives are *addere* (3), *crēdere* (36), *reddere* (11), *dēdere* (1), and *prōdere* (1). The first two of these do have *ī*-subjunctives in Plautus; it is unclear whether they could still have them in Terence's time. For *addere* the number of tokens is simply too small to be certain. Even if one assumes that the *ī*-subjunctives of *crēdere* had not lost any of their productivity, one would only expect one or two tokens in Terence.<sup>10</sup> Their absence may be due to chance, or the trend has continued and *crēdere* cannot have *ī*-forms any longer. If my hypothesis that *reddere* cannot have *ī*-subjunctives in Plautus' time is correct, the same will be true for Terence. *Dēdere* and *prōdere* only have two regular subjunctives in Terence; hence they are so rare that no irregular forms can be expected, even if they still existed when Terence wrote. *Abdere*, *ēdere*, *obdere*, *subdere*, and *uendere* do not have any subjunctives in Terence at all, so it must remain unclear whether they could form *ī*-subjunctives.

To sum up, the extra-paradigmatic *ī*-subjunctives are far more productive in main clauses than in subordinate ones. Not all compounds of *dare* behave in the same way. For many verbs I do not have sufficient data to draw firm conclusions. However, a clear picture emerges at least for *perdere*, *dare* itself, *crēdere*, and *reddere*. *Perdere* has an unusually large number of *ī*-forms, while *dare* has relatively few of them. *Crēdere* has fewer *ī*-forms in Plautus than expected and none in Terence, which may be coincidental or the result of the *ī*-forms of this verb having died out. The complete absence of *ī*-subjunctives of *reddere* in both Plautus and Terence appears to be significant.

## REGISTER

As we have seen several times, the ratio of cantica to senarii is 3 : 1 in Plautus.<sup>11</sup> According to Happ (1967), stylistically unmarked forms should have a corresponding pattern of distribution. Forms

<sup>10</sup> *Crēdere* has three *ī*-subjunctives and 67 regular subjunctives in Plautus. Since it has 36 regular subjunctives in Terence, one might expect it to have  $(36 \times 3)/67 = 1.61$ , i.e. one or two, *ī*-subjunctives beside them.

<sup>11</sup> See the introduction to this book for the technique I am using here.

belonging to an elevated style should be even more frequent in cantica, where high-register forms often occur for the only reason that these are sung or recited passages. The opposite should hold true for those forms that belong to a lower register: they are usually more frequent in senarii. We have already seen that such distribution patterns normally do not exist for extra-paradigmatic forms, and the same is true for the *ī*-subjunctives. Of the forty tokens of extra-paradigmatic *ī*-subjunctives in Plautus, twenty-two occur in cantica and eighteen in senarii. This distribution would appear to speak for colloquial rather than high register. However, this seems unlikely for morphological archaisms, which shows that Happ's criterion in itself is useless. Happ's method works well for the etymological figure and similar figures of speech, but appears insufficient for morphological archaisms. In fact, a closer look at the tokens in spoken verse makes it more likely that they belong to a higher register. Of the eighteen tokens in senarii, fifteen are at line end, a place where metrically convenient high-register archaisms like the infinitives in *-ier* are particularly frequent. Moreover, the passages in which the *ī*-forms occur are stylistically marked.

The forms in senarii are distributed as follows:

1. three in prologues and introductory scenes (*Amph.* 72, *Aul.* 62, *Men.* 267: Menaechmus II and Messenio are introduced);<sup>12</sup>
2. eight in wishes and curses with deities as subjects (*Men.* 308, *Merc.* 710, 793, *Most.* 655, 668, *Poen.* 739, *Trin.* 436, *Truc.* 331);
3. three in scenes with old men who are characterized by archaic language (*Aul.* 672: two tokens spoken by Euclio,<sup>13</sup> and *Vid.* 85: Dinia); compare:

(1) (Dinia wants to help Nicodemus, a hard-working young man.)

*Dinia:* Immo etiam argentī minam,  
quam mēd ōrāuisti ut darem tibi faenorī,  
iam ego afferam ad tē. Faenus mihi nūllum *duīs*.  
*Nicodemus:* Dī tibi illum *faxint* filium saluom tuom,  
quom mihi quī uīuam cōpiām inopī facis. (*Vid.* 83–7.)

<sup>12</sup> Moreover, the speaker in *Aul.* 62 is Euclio. Plautus characterizes him by the use of archaic forms; see Ch. 7.

<sup>13</sup> See my remarks on this character in Ch. 7.

*Dinia*: No, I'll immediately bring you the silver *mina* which you asked me to give you at interest. You *need* not *give* me any interest. *Nicodemus*: May the gods *save* your son since in my destitution you give me the means to live.

*Vid.* is of course a fragmentary play. Apart from those fragments cited by grammarians, *Dinia* only appears in the scenes in *Vid.* 18–55 and 69–91. Here, however, he uses two more high-register archaisms, *dīxīs* in l. 83 and *dēmūtāssīs* in l. 91. *Faxīs* in the scene above and *duīs* in l. 51 and l. 52, both spoken by the young man Nicodemus, are perhaps best regarded as accommodation to *Dinia*'s usage;

4. another marked passage (*Capt.* 728: Aristophontes entreats Hegio to spare Tyndarus and uses a solemn formula).

One passage remains, *Aul.* fr. v. There is hardly any context, but since this is a gastronomic instruction dressed up in the language of proverb or command, it may well be mock-solemn. Not all of the above passages necessarily belong to a higher style, but it is likely that most of them do. If so, it is probable that the restriction of our extra-paradigmatic subjunctives to such contexts is not due to chance, but can be explained by the fact that they themselves have an archaic, solemn ring to them.

If the forms belong to an elevated register in Plautus, it is likely that they do so also in Terence.

The three *ī*-subjunctives in Cato *agr.* 141. 3, Pacuvius *trag.* 219, and Turpil. *com.* 102 do not contradict this finding. The first two are in prayers, and the third is a curse with *dī* as subject. Besides, the tokens in Pacuvius and Turpilius are in cantica. With regard to the passive form *duītur* in the Twelve Tables (cited by Plin. *nat.* 21. 7), one cannot say whether it belongs to the elevated style; at the time the Twelve Tables were written and at the time commentaries were made, it may still have been part of everyday language.

## TENSE, ASPECT, AND OTHER FEATURES

Different scholars hold different views about the tense and aspect of the extra-paradigmatic *ī*-forms. Szemerényi (1987b: 895) seems to equate *duim* with the perfect subjunctive *dederim*:

What is important is that in the Latin system *duim*, beside the present-stem *dā-* and the perfect-stem *ded-*, represented an 'irregular' form, certainly not one that could be associated with the system of the infectum. That formally it was felt to be part of the perfect system, is shown by the fact that the compound *creduis creduit* not only produced a new perfect *con-crēduī* (Plautus, *Casina* 479) but also the future perfects *concreduō interduō*.

I shall deal with *concrēduō* and *interduō* later. The perfect *concrēduī*, at any rate, cannot count as evidence for *duim* having the value of a perfect subjunctive. *Concrēdere* has no attested forms in *-uim*, *-uīs* etc., but this may admittedly be due to chance. However, what is relevant in this connection is that we find new perfects like *parcuit* (Naeu. *com.* 69) beside *parsit/pepercit*. There is no *ī*-subjunctive like *†parcuim*.<sup>14</sup> The *u*-perfect is an innovation here, and it appears that *concrēduī* may simply have followed this pattern rather than being built on an extra-paradigmatic subjunctive.

Godel (1979: 233–4) thinks that the type *duim* may sometimes, in conditional clauses, have the value of the *perfectum*, but he argues that this is a secondary development. He believes that *duim*, like *uelim* or *edim*, is formed from the present stem. Presumably it should then have present meaning.

Should we equate *duim* with *dederim*, with *dem*, or with neither of them? Perhaps we can find out most easily if we ask ourselves what regular forms could substitute for *duim*. This is a legitimate question: it is *a priori* likely that the irregular forms can always be replaced by regular ones because the type *duim* is rare and on its way out. In main clauses, it is mainly found in fulfillable wishes with future reference and in prohibitions, one of them in the third person; two tokens in Plautus are in fact ambiguous between wishes and prohibitions, one in the second and another in the third person. Ex. 2 is a wish containing an *ī*-subjunctive:

(2) (One slave is cursing another.)

Dī te et tuom erum *perduint*! (*Poen.* 863.)

May the gods *destroy* you and your master!

<sup>14</sup> *Concinuī* is slightly different. Because of *canō—cecinī* one might expect *\*kon-kekinī* > *†con-cinī* (cf. *pellō—pepulī*, *appellō—appulī*); yet this was replaced by the more overtly marked *u*-perfect. Like *parcuī*, *concinuī* is a new form; neither of them can have been created because of old extra-paradigmatic *ī*-subjunctives.

This wish is fulfillable, that is, it refers to something that can still be realized.

There are also some potential subjunctives and two positive commands in the third person (one of them is the passive form *duītur* in the Twelve Tables). Ex. 3 contains two of the potential *ī*-subjunctives:

- (3) (A miser has saved his money because a bird has warned him.)

Nimis hercle ego illum coruom ad mē ueniāt uelim  
qui indicium fēcit, ut ego illic aliquid bonī  
dicam; nam quod edīt tam *duim* quam *perduim*. (*Aul.* 670–2.)

By Hercules, I really wish this raven might come to me, the one that warned me, so that I could say something nice to it. For I *would* no more *give* it something to eat than I *would destroy* the food.

Here the two *ī*-subjunctives refer to things which are possible, but which the speaker is not actually doing.

In the kind of wishes presented above and in the positive commands, the only regular forms that can be used are present subjunctives. But as shown in Ch. 4, present and also (non-past) perfect subjunctives can be found in second-person prohibitions.<sup>15</sup> For potential statements, present and perfect subjunctives are both normal in Archaic Latin. If we look at all these possible substitutes, the only common factor, the only regular form that can be used in all these contexts, is the present subjunctive. However, the perfect subjunctive can also substitute for the *ī*-forms in those contexts where it has preserved its non-past meaning; it is only the perfect subjunctives with past meaning that cannot replace *duim*. Thus *duim* could either function like a present subjunctive or be a form whose meaning oscillated between the present and the perfect subjunctive. In particular, if the past force of regular perfect subjunctives is secondary and arose by association with the perfect indicative, while the non-past semantic value in prohibitions is the original meaning, *duim* could be analysed as a *perfectum* subjunctive that has failed to acquire past force; this is what I claimed for the sigmatic subjunctives in Ch. 7.

<sup>15</sup> In 3rd-pers. prohibitions, on the other hand, the present subjunctive is the normal tense, while the perfect is very rare. There is one unambiguous 3rd-pers. prohibition with *duīt* (*Asin.* 460), while *crēduīt* (*Truc.* 307) could be either in a wish or in a prohibition.

But we must now turn to the subordinate clauses and the sequence of tenses; here we can use the results of Ch. 3, which discussed the sequence rules in detail. The type *duim* occurs six times in subordinate *nē*-clauses; in none of these instances is the superordinate verb in a past tense.<sup>16</sup> Since the subordinate verb can never be interpreted as past in these contexts, only present subjunctives can substitute for the *ī*-subjunctives:

- (4) (Euclio has hidden a pot of gold and fears that his old servant maid may know where it is.)

Nimisquē ego hanc *metuō* male  
*nē* mi ex insidiīs uerba imprudentī *duīt*  
*neu* *persentiscāt* aurum ubī est apscoditum. (*Aul.* 61–3.)

I *am* terribly *afraid* that she *may* *trick* me with a trap when I'm not suspecting it, or that she *may* *find out* where the gold is hidden.

Here the sequence of tenses shows that *duīt* could be replaced by the present subjunctive *dēt*. This analysis is confirmed by the fact that *duīt* is co-ordinated with the present subjunctive *persentiscāt*. There are no other examples of co-ordination between *ī*-subjunctives and regular forms in Plautus or Terence, but in Cato *agr.* 141. 2–3 *duīs* is co-ordinated with or parallel to the present forms *siēs*, *dēfendās*, and *āuerruncēs*, and the sigmatic/rhotacized subjunctives *prohibēssīs*, *sīrīs*, and *seruāssīs*.

There are also two examples of *ī*-forms in subordinate *ut*-clauses; compare:

- (5) (Medus is looking for his mother.)

Tē, Sōl, *inuocō*

inquirendi *ut* *mēi* parentis mihi potestātem *duīs*. (*Pacuu. trag.* 219–20.)

I *invoke* you for *help*, Sol, that you *give* me the possibility to find my parent.

Here the main clause is in the present indicative and the subordinate clause is not anterior to it, so the only form that could substitute for *duīs* would be *dēs*. The same is true of the other relevant *ut*-clause in Cato *agr.* 141. 2–3: *precōr quaesōque utī... duīs*.

<sup>16</sup> One of the *nē*-clauses (*Amph.* 845) depends on *cauē*, which shows that *cauē* is verbal here.

Sometimes an *ī*-subjunctive is in a clause which is superordinate to another clause in the subjunctive. The dependent subjunctive is always in the present tense, which would be in keeping with the non-past nature of the *ī*-subjunctive. Ex. 6 contains a dependent relative clause:

(6) (Lesbonicus is greeting Philto.)

Dī duint

tibi, Philtō, *quaequomque optēs*. (*Trin.* 436–7.)

May the gods give you, Philto, *whatever you wish*.

The subjunctive *optēs* is the result of modal attraction. It is in the present tense because it expresses present and future time and is not backshifted.<sup>17</sup> The present subjunctive is also used in indirect questions dependent on *interduim*:

(7) (A sycophant says that he is not interested in who his addressee is.)

Cēterum *quī sīs, quī nōn sīs*, floccum nōn *interduim*. (*Trin.* 994.)

Besides, I *could* not care a straw about *who* you are and *who* you are not.

Here *quī sīs* and *quī nōn sīs* are indirect questions dependent on *interduim*.<sup>18</sup>

Parallelism to similar speech acts containing regular subjunctives or imperatives would be ideal to confirm the non-past meaning of the *ī*-subjunctives. However, while there is one case of parallelism between the type *nē duīs* and imperatives, there is not a single one of parallelism to regular subjunctives in Plautus or Terence. In the following example, we find *nē duīs* and a future imperative:

(8) (Hegio has not treated well another man's slave, his prisoner. He therefore wants to forfeit the payment he could demand.)

At ob eam rem mihi libellam prō eo argenti *nē duīs*:  
grātiis ā me, ut sit liber, *dūcitō*. (*Capt.* 947–8.)

But because of this you *need not give* me one farthing for him. *Take* him away from me for free, so that he shall be a free man.

<sup>17</sup> For the term 'backshift' see Ch. 3.

<sup>18</sup> The following present subjunctives are also dependent on *ī*-subjunctives: relative clauses: *optēs* (*Pseud.* 936) and *edīt* (*Aul.* 672); indirect questions: *ēluās* and *exunguāre* (*Rud.* 580); *dum*-clause: *paritem* (*Poen.* 884); *ut sciās* in *Rud.* 1367 may be pseudo-final, in which case its tense is independent, or final, in which case it belongs here.

Here *nē duīs* and *dūcitō* seem to have the same future time reference. But as prohibitions and commands need not follow the same constraints, this might not matter.<sup>19</sup>

This is a convenient moment to discuss the prohibitions containing *ī*-subjunctives in more detail. They do not seem to have any special features. They can refer to the distant future, as in *Vid.* 83–5: *immo etiam argentī minam, quam mēd ōrāuisti ut darem tibi faenori, iam ego afferam ad tē. Faenus mihi nūllum duīs*, ‘no, I’ll bring you at once the *mina* of silver which you asked me to give to you at interest. Don’t give me any interest.’ Here the speaker will bring money first. The prohibition refers to the time after that. Consequently it has distant future reference. According to Ammann (1927: 341), *nē duīs* is preventive; but inhibitive interpretation is possible as well, for example in *Capt.* 605–6, where Hegio had been led to the belief that the speaker is a madman: *neque pol me īnsānūm, Hēgio, esse crēduīs neque fuisse umquam, neque esse morbum quem istic autumāt*, ‘don’t believe that I’m mad, Hegio, or that I’ve ever been mad, or that I have the disease he’s talking about.’ Since the addressee already believes that the speaker is mad, the prohibition could be argued to be inhibitive (‘stop believing’).

In prohibitions with *ī*-forms, other features such as the degree of politeness do not seem to matter either. All seven unambiguous second-person prohibitions in Plautus appear in polite contexts and are, in fact, mostly permissive (‘you need not do *x*’) rather than strong directives. However, the reason for this might be that six of the seven prohibitions contain the form *duīs*. The politeness is the result of the verbal meaning of *dare* rather than anything else: in most cases, someone who says ‘don’t give *x* to me’ forfeits his gain and allows the addressee to make a profit. This state of affairs is something which may be allowed, but not something which has to be ordered. The fact that this interpretation depends on the verb rather than the tense is made clear by *Enn. ann.* 194, where we find the perfect subjunctive in prohibitive function: *nec mi aurum poscō nec mī pretium dederitis*, ‘I don’t demand gold for myself and you need not give me a price.’

<sup>19</sup> *Nē duīt* and *sine* in *Asin.* 460 cannot really be called parallel. *Nē duīt* is a 3rd-pers. prohibition, *sine* a 2nd-pers. command. This is probably as insignificant as cases of co-ordination such as *faciam* (future) ... *nec* ... *duīs* (*Vid.* 50–1).

Here Pyrrhus is negotiating with the Romans; *nec... dederitis* means 'you need not give' rather than 'you are not allowed to give', although it may not be advisable to draw too firm a line, as pressing money on Pyrrhus would be an insult.

We can now return to tense and aspect. The *ī*-subjunctives are sometimes specified by temporal adverbials; in themselves these are not sufficient to prove that the *ī*-subjunctives are equivalent to other non-past subjunctives, but they do not contradict this finding. Compare:

- (9) (A slave claims that he is hard-working.)

*Sī situlam cēperō,  
numquam edepol tū mihi diuīnī crēduīs post hunc diem,  
nī ego illī puteō, si occepsō, animam omnem intertrāxerō.* (*Amph.* 671–3.)

*If I shall have got hold of a bucket, you shall never trust/may you never trust me with anything in heaven after this day if I shall not have drawn all life away from this well once I have begun.*

*Numquam* is too unspecific to allow any conclusions, but the non-past reference of *crēduīs* is supported by the phrase *post hunc diem* and by the conditional clause with the future perfect *intertrāxerō*. In *Capt.* 331, the prohibition *nē duīs* is modified by the conditional clause *si reddis* 'if you give back' (with future reference), while *Truc.* 306–8 is quite similar to Ex. 9, containing the negation *numquam* 'never', the adverbial *posthāc* 'hereafter', and the conditional clause *nī... dēnarrāuerō* 'if I shall not have told.'

One last problematic example remains, with *duint* in a conditional clause:

- (10) (Jupiter wants that the prize go to the best.)

*Sīue quī ambīssint palmam hīs histrionibus  
seu quoquam artificī (seu per scriptās litterās  
seu qui ipse ambīssit seu per internūntium),  
sīue adeo aedilēs perfidiōsē quōi duint,  
sīrempse lēgem iussit esse luppiter,  
quasi magīstrātum sibi alterīue ambīuerīt.* (*Amph.* 69–74.)

*If any people should be canvassing for the palm for these actors or any artist (be it through letters written, or if anyone should be canvassing himself or through an intermediary, or if the aediles should be giving it to someone*

unfairly), Jupiter *ordered* that the law *should be* exactly the same as if he had canvassed for an office for himself or someone else.

Here Lindsay prints *ambīssent* and *ambīssēt* for Leo's restored *ambīssint* and *ambīssīt*. The *ss*-forms are co-ordinated with *duint* and should have the same time reference. After the examples we have seen so far, it seems highly unlikely that *duint* should have the force of the pluperfect. If *ambīssint* and *ambīssīt* are correct, *duint* would have the present meaning of the sigmatic subjunctives. This seems more probable. If so, what we have here is one of those cases where the main clause has past reference (*iussit esse*), while the subordinate clauses do not have backshift of tenses. This interpretation becomes even more plausible if we consider that the preceding *ōrāre... iussit* (l. 64) has primary sequence as well.

In conclusion, it seems that the *ī*-subjunctives can always be replaced by present subjunctives and sometimes by perfect subjunctives. Perfect subjunctives can only substitute for the *ī*-forms where they have preserved their old non-past meaning, that is, in prohibitions and the type *dīxerit quispiam*. Therefore the *ī*-forms could be either equivalent to present subjunctives proper or to non-past perfect subjunctives. If the latter is correct, and if we wanted to say that *duim* is a form of the *perfectum*, we should have to argue that *duim* is a *perfectum* form which, like *faxim* (Ch. 7), has kept its original non-past meaning everywhere because *duim* has non-past force even in contexts where *dederim* would have past meaning.

## PATTERNS OF DISTRIBUTION

It is impossible to decide whether *duim* is closer to *dem* or non-past *dederim* by looking at replacement patterns. Since *dem* and non-past *dederim* have the same temporal reference, either of them can substitute for *duim*. However, it might be helpful to examine in what clause types the extra-paradigmatic forms occur most frequently. Can these patterns of distribution tell us whether *duim* behaves like present or like non-past perfect subjunctives? There are five verbs in Plautus and Terence that have special *ī*-forms, *addere*, *crēdere*, *dare*, *interdare*, and

TABLE 9.3. The distribution of forms over main clause types in Plautus

|   | $\bar{i}$ -subjunctives | Present subjunctives | Total | $\bar{i}$ -forms (%) |
|---|-------------------------|----------------------|-------|----------------------|
| Commands  | 1                       | 20.5                 | 21.5  | 4.65                 |
| Prohibitions                                    | 9                       | 4                    | 13    | 69.23                |
| Wishes  | 20                      | 46                   | 66    | 30.30                |
| Potential/unreal<br>statements and<br>questions | 4                       | 17                   | 21    | 19.05                |
| Total   | 34                      | 87.5                 | 121.5 | 27.98                |

Note: The commands include 1st-pers. pl. exhortations like *crēdāmus*, 'let us trust'.

*perdere*, but there is only one non-past perfect subjunctive among them (*dederim* in *Epid.* 258). For the moment, the analysis must therefore be restricted to the  $\bar{i}$ -forms and the present subjunctives of the same verbs. The question is whether there are any differences of usage. If there are none, *duim* could be argued to be equivalent to *dem*, but if there are distinctions, we have to look at non-past perfects of other verbs in order to see if they have patterns of distribution comparable to *duim*. Concerning the comparison between  $\bar{i}$ -forms and present subjunctives, we know that many of the  $\bar{i}$ -subjunctives occur in wishes, and we might wonder whether they share this pattern with their present tense counterparts. It might also be interesting to see whether they are distributed like regular present subjunctives in subordinate clauses.

As the  $\bar{i}$ -forms are more productive in main than in subordinate clauses, I shall look at the two clause types separately. The figures in Tables 9.3–5 do not always contain whole numbers. The reason for this is that ambiguous items were split between the two categories which they might belong to.<sup>20</sup>

The distribution of forms in Plautine main clauses can be seen in Table 9.3. In total, there are 34  $\bar{i}$ -forms with 87.5 present subjunctive counterparts in Plautus. This gives us 27.98% and 72.02%, respectively. If the  $\bar{i}$ -forms were distributed like present subjunctives, this

<sup>20</sup> The following ambiguities occur: two  $\bar{i}$ -forms in Plautus are ambiguous between wishes and prohibitions (none of the unambiguous wishes is negated); one regular subjunctive in Plautus is ambiguous between a command and a subordinate clause; and three regular forms (two in Plautus, one in Terence) are ambiguous between prohibitions and subordinate *nē*-clauses.

TABLE 9.4. The distribution of forms over main clause types in Terence

|   | $\bar{i}$ -subjunctives | Present subjunctives | Total |
|---|-------------------------|----------------------|-------|
| Commands                                  | 0                       | 5                    | 5     |
| Prohibitions                              | 0                       | 1.5                  | 1.5   |
| Wishes                                    | 8                       | 5                    | 13    |
| Potential/unreal statements and questions | 0                       | 11                   | 11    |
| Total                                     | 8                       | 22.5                 | 30.5  |

Note: Again, the commands include 1st-pers. pl. exhortations.

ratio should be found in all types of main clauses. In absolute numbers, wishes are the most frequent category among the  $\bar{i}$ -subjunctives in Plautus' main clauses, but the same is true of the present forms; the distribution shows that neither the  $\bar{i}$ -forms nor the present subjunctives are disproportionately frequent here. What is surprising is not so much the wishes as the directives, that is, the commands and prohibitions. As with the sigmatic forms, Plautus has disproportionately many prohibitions with  $\bar{i}$ -subjunctives: the nine tokens amount to 69.23% of the forms in prohibitions.<sup>21</sup> Commands with irregular forms are not entirely absent, but there is only one token with an  $\bar{i}$ -subjunctive, while there are 20.5 commands with present subjunctives; this gives us 4.65% and 95.35% instead of the expected 27.98% and 72.02%.<sup>22</sup> The  $\bar{i}$ -forms are disproportionately rare in commands.

Table 9.4 shows the distribution of forms in Terence's main clauses. All that survives of the  $\bar{i}$ -subjunctives is wishes, and they are very formulaic. In fact the  $\bar{i}$ -tokens outnumber the regular forms here. As early as Plautus, the wishes with  $\bar{i}$ -subjunctives are formulaic, but the same can be said about those with regular forms. In each case, for example, the subject is some divine entity. The reason why it is the wishes with  $\bar{i}$ -forms which survive seems to be that they have the greatest absolute frequency, 20 out of 34 main clauses with  $\bar{i}$ -in Plautus.

I have pointed out that the behaviour of  $\bar{i}$ -subjunctives in Plautine directives is remarkable. It has parallels among the subordinate

<sup>21</sup> The likelihood that this finding is statistically significant is between 99.5% and 99.95%, as a t-test shows.

<sup>22</sup> The likelihood that this pattern is statistically significant is higher than 99.95%, as can be seen from a t-test.

TABLE 9.5. The distribution of forms over subordinate clause types in Plautus

|   | $\bar{i}$ -subjunctives | Present subjunctives | Total | $\bar{i}$ -forms (%) |
|---|-------------------------|----------------------|-------|----------------------|
| Subordinate <i>ut</i> /object clauses without <i>ut</i> | 0                       | 57.5                 | 57.5  | 0                    |
| Subordinate <i>nē</i>                                   | 5                       | 15                   | 20    | 25                   |
| Conditional clauses                                     | 1                       | 8                    | 9     | 11.11                |
| Indirect questions and relative clauses                 | 0                       | 72                   | 72    | 0                    |
| Other subordinate clauses                               | 0                       | 12                   | 12    | 0                    |
| Total   | 6                       | 164.5                | 170.5 | 3.52                 |

Note: The 'other subordinate clauses' are 3 *quīn*-clauses, 1 causal clause, 3 temporal clauses, 3 comparative clauses, and 2 limiting clauses.

clauses if there is a connection between commands and *ut*-clauses on the one hand, and between prohibitions and *nē*-clauses on the other. Table 9.5 presents the distribution of forms in subordinate clauses in Plautus.

There are six  $\bar{i}$ -forms with 164.5 present subjunctive counterparts. Expressed in percentages, this is 3.52% versus 96.48%; these percentages ought to recur among all clause types if the  $\bar{i}$ -forms behaved in the same way as present subjunctives. Given this overall ratio, we might expect two or three  $\bar{i}$ -forms each in *ut*-clauses and in indirect questions and relative clauses. However, there are none, and it is again the *nē*-clauses that predominate, as with the sigmatic subjunctives. Here the percentages are not 3.52% of  $\bar{i}$ -forms and 96.48% of present subjunctives, as one might expect, but 25% of  $\bar{i}$ -forms and 75% of present subjunctives (5 tokens with  $\bar{i}$ - and 15 present forms).<sup>23</sup> There is only one token in Terence; it is also found in a *nē*-clause, while the present forms are distributed like those in Plautus.<sup>24</sup>

We have now seen clear similarities between the distribution patterns of sigmatic subjunctives (Ch. 7) and  $\bar{i}$ -subjunctives: both types are disproportionately frequent in prohibitions and *nē*-clauses, but

<sup>23</sup> The likelihood that these findings for *ut*- and *nē*-clauses are statistically significant is higher than 99.95%, as t-tests demonstrate.

<sup>24</sup> The figures for present subjunctives of our five verbs are as follows in subordinate clauses in Terence: *ut*: 14; *nē*: 8.5; conditional clauses: 2; indirect questions and relative clauses: 23; other subordinate clauses: 5 (a *quīn*-clause, a causal clause, a temporal clause, a comparative clause, and a thematic *quod*-clause).

**TABLE 9.6.** The distribution of present subjunctives, perfect/sigmatic subjunctives, and *ī*-forms in prohibitions in Plautus and Terence

|                      | 2nd pers. | 3rd pers. | Total |
|----------------------|-----------|-----------|-------|
| Present              | 21        | 40        | 61    |
| Perfect and sigmatic | 73        | 2         | 75    |
| - <i>ī</i> -         | 7         | 1         | 8     |
| Total                | 101       | 43        | 144   |

*Note:* The figures for present, perfect, and sigmatic subjunctives are taken from Ch. 7. I have not included rhotacized forms like *sīrīs*. I have only counted tokens with -*ī*- that are unambiguously prohibitive. They all come from Plautus.

very rare in commands and *ut*-clauses. Perfect subjunctives have similar properties, but only in main clauses: they can be used in prohibitions, where they do not have past meaning, yet they are entirely absent in commands. If this complete absence from commands was originally an absolute restriction for the *ī*-subjunctives as well, the one token in a command could be explained by the fact that synchronically, the *ī*-subjunctives are getting closer to the regular present subjunctives, whose temporal meanings they share everywhere; the regular perfect subjunctives could not spread to commands because by the time the *ī*-subjunctives began to be used in this way, the perfect subjunctives had already acquired past meaning in most contexts, making *nē fēcerīs* with non-past meaning an idiomatic exception.

Prohibitions containing perfect and sigmatic subjunctives are very rare in the third person, a restriction which is not shared by present subjunctive prohibitions. Again, the *ī*-subjunctives seem to behave like the perfect and sigmatic forms (Table 9.6).

The *ī*-subjunctives share the distribution patterns of perfect and sigmatic subjunctives, not those of the present forms. There are seven prohibitions with -*ī*- in the second person, but there is only one in the third.

To sum up, the same two restrictions seem to apply to sigmatic subjunctives and *ī*-forms: first, they are very rare in commands and *ut*-clauses, but frequent in prohibitions and *nē*-clauses; and second, the prohibitions containing such forms are almost exclusively addressed to second persons. In all subordinate and many main clauses, perfect subjunctives have secondarily acquired past meaning. In main clauses, however, they share the properties of the *ī*-forms and the

sigmatic subjunctives in directives. If I can anticipate a bit and move from meaning to form, there is no objection to treating *duim* as a *perfectum* subjunctive that has failed to get past meaning, which is also true of sigmatic forms like *faxim*. The reason why there is no past meaning is presumably the absence of perfect indicatives like †*duī* or †*faxī*.<sup>25</sup> If this is true, Szemerényi's view that *duim* should be considered a *perfectum* form turns out to be correct, but has to be modified: *duim* is a *perfectum* subjunctive which has not acquired past meaning.

## CONCLUSIONS

The extra-paradigmatic *ī*-subjunctives are rare as early as Plautus and Terence. In both authors, they are considerably more productive in main than in subordinate clauses. Most forms belong to *perdere*, while the *ī*-subjunctives of *dare* itself and of *crēdere* appear to be less productive. The absence of such forms among the tokens of *reddere* is probably not due to chance.

Since the *ī*-forms are obsolescent, it should come as no surprise that they belong to a higher register.

It is always possible to replace the *ī*-subjunctives by regular present forms, and it seems that they have the same temporal meaning. Under certain circumstances, the *ī*-subjunctives could also be replaced by perfect subjunctives; this is the case in prohibitions and the type *dixerit quispiam*. But these are exactly the circumstances where the perfect subjunctives have preserved their old non-past meaning. In directives, the forms with *-ī-* share two peculiarities not with the present subjunctives, but with the perfect forms: the *ī*-subjunctives hardly ever occur in commands, but can be found in prohibitions; and in prohibitions, they are more frequent in the second person than in the third. Thus it makes sense to regard *duim* as an old *perfectum* subjunctive which has, however, not taken on the past meaning of the regular perfect subjunctives anywhere. In this respect,

<sup>25</sup> The instances where we do find such perfects, e.g. *concrēduī* or *parsī*, are, at least from a synchronic point of view, independent of our formations and do not occur systematically, cf. also the regular subjunctive *parseris* next to *parsis*.

the *ī*-subjunctives resemble the sigmatic subjunctives, which have the same two restrictions in directives and which, like the *ī*-forms, are also rare in *ut*-clauses, but frequent in *nē*-clauses.

#### AN ADDENDUM: THE INDICATIVE FORMS IN ARCHAIC LATIN

Besides subjunctives of the type *interduim* we also find a few indicative forms such as *interduō* in Archaic Latin. Apart from the first person singular (*concrēduō* and *interduō*), we only have third-person forms, and here indicative and subjunctive look the same. There must have been an original difference in quantity between *duīt* (indicative) and *duīt* (subjunctive), but the verses we have do not show it. This makes it difficult to distinguish between the two moods; I have classified six tokens as indicatives. Their temporal meaning is hard to establish because they are very rare. *LLF* 528 regards them as futures or future perfects.

Future perfect meaning is likely in the following three examples:

(11) (Paul the Deacon quotes a law supposedly going back to King Numa Pompilius.)

*Sī quī hominem liberum dolō sciēns mortī duit, pāricidās*<sup>26</sup> *estō*. (Lex reg. ap. Paul. Fest. p. 247.)

If anyone *shall have given* a free man to death with full knowledge and with malice aforethought, he shall be a parricide.

(12) (The *patria potestās* can cease under certain conditions.)

*Sī pater filium ter uēnum duit, filius ā patre liber estō*. (Lex XII tab. ap. Gaius *inst.* 1. 132.)

If a father *shall have given* his son for sale three times, the son shall be free of the father.

<sup>26</sup> Old laws were of course not transmitted without changes in spelling. Paul the Deacon cites the law because of *parricīda*, which many Romans regarded as a special form of *patricīda*. However, if the first element in *parricīda* is related to Greek *πρῶς* 'kinsman', the form must still have been *\*pāsokaidās* in Numa's time, and the *-s-* underwent rhotacism later. The *-rr-* in *pārricīda* is due to the *littera*-rule (*littera* > *littera*), which applied after rhotacism.

(13) (Festus cites an old law on weights, probably from the 3rd c. BC.)

*Sī quis magistrātus aduersus hāc dolō malō pondera modiōsque uāsaque pūblica modica, minōra maiōraue faxit iussitue fieri dolumue adduit quō ea fiant, eum quis uolēt magistrātus multāre ... licētō; sīue quis im sacrum iūdicāre uoluerit, licētō.* (Lex Sil. ap. Fest. p. 288.)

If against these regulations, with malice aforethought, any magistrate shall have made the weights, the measuring-vessels, and the public measuring-containers smaller or bigger, or shall have ordered that they should be made smaller or bigger, or *shall have applied* malice whereby this should happen, then any magistrate shall be allowed ... to punish him; or if anyone shall have wanted to declare him an outlaw, it shall be allowed.

In Ex. 11, which is a *lēx rēgia*, and in Ex. 12, which is from the Twelve Tables, *duit* is anterior to the future imperative *estō*. In Classical Latin, this would be expressed by the future perfect *dederit*. However, the present indicative is also attested in such contexts in the Twelve Tables, as the well-known *sī in iūs uocāt, itō* at the beginning of the Twelve Tables shows: ‘if he (*x*) calls (present) to court, he (*y*) shall go.’ Still, *duit* is likely to function as a future perfect in Exx. 11 and 12 because it can be shown that *adduit* in Ex. 13 probably has this meaning; in fact, *adduit* is parallel to *faxit*, which I discussed in Ch. 7, and *iussit*, which also seems to be a sigmatic future.<sup>27</sup> Since *adduit* is co-ordinated with these two forms, it probably has the same function. If so, *concrēduō* in Ex. 14 could also be a future perfect:

(14) (Euclio wants to hide his gold in the shrine of *Fidēs*, ‘Faith’.)

*Fidēs, nōuisti me et egō tē: cauē sīs tibi,  
nē tu immūtāssīs nōmen, si hoc concrēduō.* (Aul. 584–5.)

Faith, you know me and I know you; watch out, don’t change your name if I *shall have entrusted* this to you.

*Sī concrēduō* is anterior to *nē tu immūtāssīs*, which must have future reference because it is a prohibition.

But do these indicatives always have future perfect meaning? Sometimes present tense meaning seems more plausible:

<sup>27</sup> Besides, the following conditional clause contains the future perfect as well.

(15) (There are certain exceptions to the *lĕx Cincia dē dōnātiōnibus* of 204 BC.)

Item excipit: 'sī quis ā seruīs suīs quīque prō seruīs seruitūtem seruiērunt, accipit *duit*'. (Lex Cincia, fr. Vat. 307.)

In the same way he makes an exception: 'if anyone accepts anything from his slaves or those who served as slaves, or if he *gives* to anyone of them'.

(16) Quod uolt dēnsūm, ciccūm nōn *interduō*. (Plaut. inc. fab. fr. ii.)

As for the fact that he wants it thick, I *do* not *give* a damn.

In the conditional clause in Ex. 15, the writer has chosen the present indicative *accipit*, not the future perfect *accēperit*, which must have seemed less appropriate to him. As *duit* is parallel to the present *accipit*, it is likely to share its present tense meaning. There is no reason why the two forms should be in different tenses: if *duit* were a future perfect, we should also expect *accēperit*. Ex. 16 does not have any context, but can be compared with phrases like *ciccūm nōn interduim* (*Rud.* 580) or *mēum tergum floccī faciō* (*Epid.* 348), which regularly have present meaning, regardless of the mood.

How can this discrepancy be explained? I do not have many data, but it seems that the future perfect meaning is older. The reason for this is that the sigmatic and the *ī*-forms are similar in several respects. I argued that the sigmatic subjunctives (type *faxīs*) and the *ī*-subjunctives (type *duīs*) have comparable meanings and patterns of distribution, and that this is unlikely to be due to chance. Since the indicative *faxīs* functions like a future perfect, it is not surprising that the old indicatives *duit* and *adduit* should do so as well.

Why, then, does *interduō* have present tense meaning? Presumably indicatives like *duit* were so rare that they were no longer understood properly, and some speakers began to regard them as presents. This wrong analysis could have started in conditional clauses with future reference, where we find not only future perfects, but also presents (type *sī in iūs uocāt, ītō*).

This explanation is in agreement with the chronology: Exx. 11–13 with future perfect meaning are older than Exx. 15 and 16 with present meaning. The Twelve Tables (Ex. 12) were written around 450 BC, the law in Ex. 11 may be even earlier, and the *lex Silia* (Ex. 13) dates from the third century BC. By contrast, the *lex Cincia* (Ex. 15) was introduced at the very end of the third century (204 BC), which is also roughly when Ex. 16 was written.

## The Type *attigās* in Archaic Latin

AFTER discussing the sigmatic subjunctives (Ch. 7) and the *ī*-forms (Ch. 9), we can now turn to the last type of extra-paradigmatic subjunctives in Archaic Latin; as in Chs. 7 and 9, the results of Chs. 3 (sequence rules) and 4 (prohibitive clauses) will be relevant here. All regular present subjunctives except for those of the first conjugation contain the morpheme *-ā-*. The subjunctives of the other tenses are formed with different morphemes: we find *-ī-* in the perfect and *-ē-* in the imperfect and the pluperfect. However, the formant *-ā-* also occurs in a handful of subjunctives that do not belong to the present stem.<sup>1</sup> They are restricted to five roots; examples are *crēduās* (root *du-* ‘give’/‘put’), *fuās* (root *fu-* ‘be’/‘become’), *attigās* (root *tag-* ‘touch’), *apstulās* (root *tul-* ‘carry’/‘lift’), and *aduenās* (root *uen-* ‘come’).<sup>2</sup> The respective present subjunctives are *crēdās*, *sīs*, *attigās*, *auferās*, and *adueniās*. What makes the extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctives so unusual is the combination of the *ā*-morpheme with a non-present stem. This morphological oddity raises questions about the meaning and usage of the irregular *ā*-forms.

In all Latin, there are only thirteen verbs that have irregular *ā*-subjunctives; they are *accrēdere*, *crēdere*, *dare* (root *du-*); *deesse*, *esse*

<sup>1</sup> My collection of forms is based on my own reading and a search in which I employed the *BTL* and Neue and Wagener (1897: 237–41 and 600–2).

<sup>2</sup> All these roots can be traced back to Indo-European, where they must have been telic because they form root aorists. For the concept of telicity see Ch. 5. For the influence of telicity on morphology in Indo-European see Hoffmann (1970). The individual roots with their stem formations can be found in the *LIV*; for *du-* < *\*deH<sub>3</sub>-* and *\*d<sup>h</sup>eH<sub>1</sub>-* see 105–6 and 136–8, for *fu-* < *\*b<sup>h</sup>uH-* see 98–101, for *tag-* < *\*teH<sub>2</sub>g-* see 616–17, for *tul-* < *\*telH<sub>2</sub>-* see 622–3, and for *uen-* < *\*g<sup>w</sup>em-* see 209–10. From a synchronic perspective, however, some of the verbs are atelic. *Crēduās* ‘you may believe’ can hardly be telic because it does not involve an endpoint.

(root *fu-*); *attingere, tangere* (root *tag-*); *afferre, auferre, ferre* (root *tul-*); *aduenīre, ēuenīre, peruenīre* (root *uen-*). Like the sigmatic subjunctives, the extra-paradigmatic *ā*-forms are already dying out in Archaic Latin. Plautus still has forty-five tokens belonging to ten verbs built on five different roots. Terence merely has a subset of the Plautine forms. He has three tokens belonging to three verbs from three different roots. The rarity as well as the decline of the forms cannot go unnoticed, even if we take into account that the corpus of Plautus is three times as large as that of Terence. Outside Plautus and Terence, we find twenty such extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctives in Archaic Latin. They are distributed as follows: two in Accius (*trag.* 102 and 304), one in Afranius (*com.* 280), two in Ennius (*scaen.* 142 and 170), one in Livius Andronicus (*trag.* 23), one in Novius (*Atell.* 87), five in Pacuvius (*trag.* 42, 116, 165, and 228 with two tokens), one in Pomponius (*Atell.* 35), one in Titinius (*com.* 33), one in Turpilius (*com.* 106), and two in tragedies by unknown authors cited by Gellius and Charisius (*Trag. inc.* 122 and 148); in non-literary sources there is one such form in a *plēbiscītum* of M. Plaetorius (cited in *Cens.* 24. 3), and there are two in inscriptions on lamps (*CIL* i<sup>2</sup>. 499, 500).

We can compare the extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctives with the regular forms of the same verbs. The verbs with special *ā*-subjunctives in Plautus and Terence have 1321 regular subjunctive counterparts in Plautus and 495 in Terence. We can now add up the extra-paradigmatic *ā*-forms and the regular subjunctives and then calculate the percentage of extra-paradigmatic *ā*-forms of this total. This gives us the relative frequency of the special *ā*-subjunctives. It is 3.29% for Plautus and 0.60% for Terence. These low figures further demonstrate that the irregular *ā*-subjunctives were on their way out in Archaic Latin.

The questions which arise with regard to these forms are almost the same as those concerning the sigmatic subjunctives or the *ī*-forms like *duim*:

1. The overall productivity of the extra-paradigmatic forms is low, but are there differences in usage between main and subordinate clauses, or between the various verbs?
2. Do the forms belong to any particular register?

3. Do the irregular  $\bar{a}$ -subjunctives have special temporal or aspectual meanings or any other noticeable features?
4. Are there any peculiarities in the distribution of the forms?
5. What are the origins of the relevant non-present stems and the  $\bar{a}$ -morph? Does the  $-\bar{a}-$  in *attigās* have a synchronic function that is different from the  $-\bar{a}-$  of the present subjunctive *attingās* or from the  $-\bar{i}-$  in the sigmatic forms, *duīs*, or *sīs*?

I shall discuss these questions in turn, except for question 5, which I discussed in de Melo 2004a. My conclusion there was that all the relevant stems go back to aorist stems and that the  $-\bar{a}-$  is not functionally distinct from other subjunctive morphs. I did not venture a diachronic explanation of the  $-\bar{a}-$ , but merely pointed out that this functional identity between the various subjunctive morphs makes it more difficult to find out about the origins of  $-\bar{a}-$ . But now I shall turn to the other questions. For the first and fourth sections I have to rely almost exclusively on Plautus and Terence because I need statistics, and it is only these two authors that provide enough data for my purposes.

## FREQUENCY AND PRODUCTIVITY

Not only the extra-paradigmatic  $\bar{a}$ -forms, but also the sigmatic and the  $\bar{i}$ -subjunctives are dying out. Is this reflected in similar patterns of distribution? As I showed in Chs. 7 and 9, the sigmatic subjunctives and the  $\bar{i}$ -forms are more frequent in main than in subordinate clauses, while it is the other way round for their regular counterparts.<sup>3</sup> In Plautus, for instance, 35 out of the 40 irregular  $\bar{i}$ -subjunctives are in main clauses, but only 98 out of 333 of their regular counterparts can be found in main clauses. I argued that the reason for this pattern is the fact that subjunctives in main clauses have more ‘meaning’ than those in subordinate clauses. In main clauses, there

<sup>3</sup> The fact that e.g.  $\bar{i}$ -subjunctives often occur in fixed expressions and that such expressions seem to be more frequent in main than in subordinate clauses cannot explain these patterns. Their regular counterparts occur in the same or similar expressions, which are again more frequent in main clauses.

is normally a choice between indicative and subjunctive, and that choice goes hand in hand with a clear semantic contrast between the two moods. In subordinate clauses the subordinator often demands the subjunctive; since there is no choice in that case, the mood cannot contribute much to the semantics. Obsolescent forms like the sigmatic subjunctives or the *ī*-forms are naturally more frequent in contexts where they have more 'meaning' because the use of such subjunctives is a conscious decision. Now in Plautus the extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctives are distributed more or less evenly over main and subordinate clauses: there are 21 tokens in main clauses and 22 in subordinate ones. Does that mean that the special *ā*-forms do not follow the same pattern as other moribund subjunctives? Not necessarily. The regular subjunctives of the verbs with extra-paradigmatic *ā*-forms are, in proportion, much rarer in main clauses than the regular subjunctives of the verbs with sigmatic forms and *ī*-subjunctives. Despite first appearances, there may therefore still be similarities between the sigmatic subjunctives together with the *ī*-forms and the extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctives. One could hypothesize that all irregular forms are more likely to occur in main clauses than their regular counterparts. It does not follow that more than half of the irregular forms must be in main clauses; all that does follow is that the proportion of forms in main clauses to forms in subordinate clauses is different for regular and irregular forms.

In the rest of this section, I count the type *cauē attigās* among the main clause prohibitions, and the auxiliaries (types *captī fuant* and *captī sient*) among the tokens in subordinate clauses. One reason for doing so is that auxiliaries, like subjunctives in subordinate clauses, do not make a great contribution to the meaning. I split the forms in other clauses which are ambiguous between main and subordinate clauses, even though this will not always yield numbers.<sup>4</sup> 48.84% of the extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctives in Plautus occur in main clauses (21 out of 43 tokens), while only 14.31% of their regular counterparts in Plautus are found in main clauses (189 out of 1321

<sup>4</sup> I leave out two irregular *ā*-subjunctives in Plautus whose contexts cannot be recovered. Two other extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctives in Plautus are in clauses that are ambiguous between prohibitions and subordinate *nē*-clauses. Among the regular subjunctives, 22 in Plautus and three in Terence are in clauses that could be analysed as either main or subordinate clauses.

TABLE 10.1. Extra-paradigmatic  $\bar{a}$ -forms and regular subjunctives in main and subordinate clauses

|  | Extra-paradigmatic $\bar{a}$ -subjunctives | Regular subjunctives | Total | Extra-paradigmatic $\bar{a}$ -subjunctives (%) |
|--|--|----------------------|-------|--|
| Main clauses Plautus (with <i>cauē</i> )       | 21   | 189                  | 210   | 10   |
| Main clauses Terence (with <i>cauē</i> )       | 3  | 54.5                 | 57.5  | 5.22   |
| Subordinate clauses Plautus (with auxiliaries) | 22   | 1132                 | 1154  | 1.91   |
| Subordinate clauses Terence (with auxiliaries) | 0  | 438.5                | 438.5 | 0  |

tokens).<sup>5</sup> In Ch. 9, I showed that 85% (35 out of 40 tokens) of the  $\bar{i}$ -forms and 29.43% (98 out of 333 tokens) of their regular counterparts are main clause subjunctives in Plautus. Thus the above hypothesis is correct: both types of extra-paradigmatic subjunctives,  $\bar{i}$ -forms and extra-paradigmatic  $\bar{a}$ -forms, are more likely to occur in main clauses than their regular counterparts. If the irregular  $\bar{a}$ -subjunctives and their regular counterparts are less frequent in main clauses than the  $\bar{i}$ -subjunctives and their regular counterparts, respectively, this must be due to the lexical meanings of the verbs in question.

My next question is what is the proportion of extra-paradigmatic  $\bar{a}$ -forms to the fully productive regular subjunctives in main and subordinate clauses. Table 10.1 offers an answer.

The percentage of extra-paradigmatic  $\bar{a}$ -forms is considerably higher in main clauses than in subordinate ones.<sup>6</sup> This indicates that the irregular  $\bar{a}$ -forms are more common in main than in subordinate clauses.

<sup>5</sup> The three extra-paradigmatic  $\bar{a}$ -subjunctives in Terence occur in main clauses, but this number is too small to allow any conclusions. If we split the three regular subjunctives in Terence that are ambiguous between main and subordinate clause subjunctives, 11.05% of the regular subjunctives can be found in main clauses (54.5 out of 493 tokens).

<sup>6</sup> The likelihood that this finding is statistically significant for Plautus is higher than 99.95%, as can be seen from a t-test.

There are ten verbs in Plautus which have special *ā*-subjunctives: *accrēdere* (*accrēduās*), *crēdere* (*crēduās*), *dare* (*duās*), *deesse* (*dēfuās*), *esse* (*fuās*), *attingere* (*attigās*), *auferre* (*apstulās*), *aduenīre* (*aduenās*), *ēuenīre* (*ēuenās*), and *peruenīre* (*peruenās*). Some of them, like *attingere*, seem to take irregular *ā*-forms quite freely, while others, such as *dare*, do not seem to do so: *duās* is only attested twice. Is this impression correct? I shall concentrate on Plautus. In total, there are 45 extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctives in Plautus,<sup>7</sup> which have 1321 regular counterparts. Together, these are 1366 forms. This gives us 3.29% of irregular *ā*-forms and 96.71% of regular subjunctives. If all extra-paradigmatic forms were equally productive, this ratio of irregular to regular subjunctives should recur for each verb that has extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctives.

Another question that arises in this connection is whether the absence of forms like *\*adduās* is due to chance, or whether the other verbs belonging to our five roots cannot have extra-paradigmatic *ā*-forms for morphological or semantic reasons. Again, the percentages of 3.29% of special *ā*-forms and 96.71% of regular subjunctives might be helpful: if a compound like *addere* were frequent and had many regular subjunctives, so that 3.29% of this number would for example yield a figure of nine or ten, then the absence of these nine or ten extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctives could hardly be fortuitous, and I should have to conclude that the verb could only form regular subjunctives. On the other hand, if *addere* were rare and had only two regular subjunctives, one could not tell if the absence of *\*adduās* were due to chance or the result of morphological or semantic restrictions. I shall now consider the roots in Plautus one by one.

### The Root *du-*

In Plautus, *accrēdere*, *crēdere*, and *dare* have forms like *accrēduās* next to regular subjunctives like *accrēdās*. As is well known, diachronically these verbs go back to two different roots, but in this chapter I do not distinguish between the original roots *\*deH<sub>3</sub>*- ‘give’ and *\*d<sup>h</sup>eH<sub>1</sub>*- ‘put’.

<sup>7</sup> In what follows, I include the two tokens whose context is unclear (*Men.* 171 and *Rud. fr.*).

TABLE 10.2. Irregular and regular subjunctives of *accrēdere*, *crēdere*, and *dare* in Plautus

|                               | Extra-<br>paradigmatic<br><i>ā</i> -subjunctives | Regular<br>subjunctives | Total | <i>ā</i> -forms (%) |
|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------|-------|---------------------|
| <i>accrēdere</i>              | 1  | 1                       | 2     | 50                  |
| <i>crēdere</i>                | 5  | 67                      | 72    | 6.94                |
| <i>dare</i>                   | 2  | 202                     | 204   | 0.98                |
| Total <i>dare</i> + compounds | 8  | 270                     | 278   | 2.88                |

Originally, it was only *\*deH<sub>3</sub>-* and its compounds that had *u*-forms, but once the two roots had merged, *-u-* spread to the compounds of what used to be *\*d<sup>h</sup>eH<sub>1</sub>-*, for example to *crēdere*. In Table 10.2, I contrast the regular with the irregular subjunctives.

The overall number of extra-paradigmatic *ā*-forms of *accrēdere*, *crēdere*, and *dare* is marginally lower than expected: the special *ā*-forms make up 2.88% of the total rather than 3.29%. Not much can be learnt from *accrēdere* because it has only two subjunctives. *Crēdere* has more extra-paradigmatic *ā*-forms than average, while *dare* has fewer. As I pointed out in the chapter on *ī*-subjunctives, *crēdere* has, on the other hand, only three *ī*-forms in Plautus, while *dare* has fourteen. Thus it seems that the choice between *-ī-* and *-ā-* is in part determined lexically. *Addere*, *interdare*, and *perdere* have *ī*-subjunctives in Plautus, but no extra-paradigmatic *ā*-forms. In the case of *addere* and *interdare*, this may be fortuitous because there are not many tokens: *addere* has only seven regular subjunctives, and *interdare* has no regular forms at all. But *perdere* has sixty regular subjunctives and twenty *ī*-forms, so the absence of irregular *ā*-subjunctives is significant. If *perdere* ever had such *ā*-forms, they have been ousted by the *ī*-subjunctives. *Reddere* has thirty-six regular subjunctives. If it can have extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctives, and if they are as productive as those of *accrēdere*, *crēdere*, and *dare* taken together, there should be one token beside the thirty-six regular subjunctives.<sup>8</sup> The absence of forms like †*redduās* may be due to chance. *Apscondere*, *concrēdere*,

<sup>8</sup> *Accrēdere*, *crēdere*, and *dare* have eight *ā*-forms and 270 corresponding present subjunctives.  $(36 \times 8)/270 = 1.07$ , so there ought to be one *ā*-subjunctive.

TABLE 10.3. Irregular and regular subjunctives of *deesse* and *esse* in Plautus

|                                   | Extra-<br>paradigmatic<br><i>ā</i> -subjunctives | Regular<br>subjunctives | Total | <i>ā</i> -forms (%) |
|-----------------------------------|--|-------------------------|-------|---------------------|
| <i>deesse</i>                     | 1  | 4                       | 5     | 20                  |
| <i>esse</i>                       | 22   | 976                     | 998   | 2.20                |
| Total <i>deesse</i> + <i>esse</i> | 23   | 980                     | 1003  | 2.29                |

*condere*, *dēdere*, *indere*, *recondere*, *subdere*, and *uendere* taken together have thirty-two regular subjunctives in Plautus, fewer than *reddere* on its own; this number is so small that the lack of extra-paradigmatic *ā*-forms is not surprising, even if they existed, which one cannot tell. The other compounds have no subjunctives at all in Plautus (*abdere*, *circumdare*, *dīdere*, *disperdere*, *ēdere*, *obdere*, *prōdere*). Since these verbs are so rare that not even the regular subjunctives occur in my corpus, I cannot say whether the verbs had special forms or not.

### The Root *fu-*

Looking at verbs formed from the roots *es-* and *fu-*, I find that only two have extra-paradigmatic forms: *esse* and *deesse* with their subjunctives *fuāt* and *dēfuāt*. Table 10.3 contrasts the irregular and the regular subjunctives (e.g. *sīs*, *essēs*, *fuerīs*, and *fuissēs*).

There are not enough tokens of *deesse* to allow us to reach any conclusions, but the extra-paradigmatic forms of *esse* are less frequent than average (2.20% of all subjunctives instead of 3.29%). Concerning compounds of *esse*, the most frequent is *posse/potesse* (for this form cf. *Most.* 1015), which has 112 regular subjunctives in Plautus, but no special *ā*-subjunctives. However, *posse* is different from the other compounds in that its perfect is *pot-uī* (as if from *\*potēre*, cf. *potēns*) rather than †*pof-fuī*. Thus it was perhaps no longer felt to be a proper compound of *esse*, which could explain the absence of extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctives. The fact that *posse* used to be a regular compound of *esse* can still be seen very clearly in those cases

where there is tmesis (type *potis fui*). However, in Plautus subjunctives of *posse* are found in tmesis only three times. *Abesse*, *adesse*, *inesse*, *obesse*, *praeesse*, *prōdesse*, *subesse*, and *superesse* together have 46 regular subjunctives in Plautus. Even if they could form special  $\bar{a}$ -subjunctives, I should expect only one token, assuming that the percentages of extra-paradigmatic forms and regular subjunctives are like those under ‘total *desse* + *esse*’.<sup>9</sup> If so, the absence may be due to pure chance, and it is impossible to know if these verbs had irregular  $\bar{a}$ -subjunctives. *Interesse* has no subjunctives at all in Plautus, so it is unclear whether it could have extra-paradigmatic  $\bar{a}$ -subjunctives. *Confore* (the present infinitive is not attested in Plautus) has neither indicatives nor regular subjunctives, which makes the existence of  $\bar{a}$ -subjunctives highly unlikely.

### The Root *tag-*

The regular present subjunctive *attingās* has a present indicative *attingis* beside it. The extra-paradigmatic subjunctive *attigās*, by contrast, does not have any forms like †*attigis* next to it. The extra-paradigmatic  $\bar{a}$ -forms of *attingere* are disproportionately frequent; there are five of them, just as many as there are regular subjunctives. *Tangere* and the compounds *contingere* and *optingere* together have eight regular subjunctives. If these verbs had irregular  $\bar{a}$ -subjunctives which were as productive as those of *attingere*, one would expect eight extra-paradigmatic forms as well. However, if the special  $\bar{a}$ -forms of these verbs were only as productive as those of all the verbs with irregular  $\bar{a}$ -forms taken together, not a single extra-paradigmatic  $\bar{a}$ -form would be expected to occur in Plautus.<sup>10</sup> Thus it is impossible to know from looking at Plautus if *tangere* or its compounds apart from *attingere* also formed extra-paradigmatic  $\bar{a}$ -subjunctives. *Tangere* at least has a special  $\bar{a}$ -subjunctive *tagam* in Pacuu. trag. 165.

<sup>9</sup>  $(46 \times 23)/980 = 1.06$ , i.e. one token.

<sup>10</sup> In total there are 45 special  $\bar{a}$ -forms and 1321 regular subjunctives.  $(8 \times 45)/1321 = 0.27$ , i.e. there should not be any irregular tokens at all.

The Root *tul-*

*Auferre* (present subjunctive *auferās*) has one extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctive *apstulās* beside 33 regular forms. Thus the proportion of special *ā*-forms and regular subjunctives of *auferre* is more or less as expected, but as there is only one extra-paradigmatic token, this does not mean much. There are 49 regular subjunctives belonging to *ferre* and 65 belonging to the compounds *afferre*, *attollere*, *cōnferre*, *dēferre*, *efferre*, *īnferre*, *offerre*, *perferre*, *prōferre*, *rēferre*, *rēferre*, *sufferre*, and *sustollere*.<sup>11</sup> If these verbs had irregular *ā*-subjunctives, and if they were as productive as extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctives in general, one would expect four special *ā*-subjunctives beside the 114 regular forms.<sup>12</sup> Conceivably their absence means that not every verb can have such extra-paradigmatic forms, but it is impossible to say which by merely examining Plautus. At least *ferre* and *afferre* can form extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctives because there is one token of *tulāt* in Acc. *trag.* 102, and *attulās/attulāt* is attested three times: Pacuu. *trag.* 42, 228, and Nouius *Atell.* 87. *Circumferre*, *contollere*, *extollere*, *prōtollere*, and *trānsferre* do not have any subjunctives in Plautus, so it is impossible to tell whether these verbs had special *ā*-forms.<sup>13</sup>

The Root *uen-*

Next to present subjunctives like *adueniāt* one also finds extra-paradigmatic forms such as *aduenāt*. Table 10.4 presents the proportions of irregular *ā*-forms to regular subjunctives for the verbs *aduenīre*, *ēuenīre*, and *peruenīre*.

The extra-paradigmatic *ā*-forms of *aduenīre*, *ēuenīre*, and *peruenīre* are all more frequent than average, but the number of tokens of *aduenīre* and *peruenīre* is too small to allow far-reaching conclusions.

<sup>11</sup> If the one instance of *circumferam* in Plaut. fab. inc. fr. 48 (68) is a subjunctive rather than a future, there are 66 regular subjunctives of compounds of *ferre* and *tollere*.

<sup>12</sup>  $(114 \times 45)/1321 = 3.88$ , i.e. there should be four tokens.

<sup>13</sup> The one instance of *circumferam* in Plaut. fab. inc. fr. 48 (68) might conceivably be a subjunctive rather than a future.

TABLE 10.4. Irregular and regular subjunctives of *aduenīre*, *ēuenīre*, and *peruenīre* in Plautus

|  | Extra-<br>paradigmatic<br><i>ā</i> -subjunctives | Regular<br>subjunctives | Total | <i>ā</i> -forms (%) |
|--|--|-------------------------|-------|---------------------|
| <i>aduenīre</i>  | 1  | 13                      | 14    | 7.14                |
| <i>ēuenīre</i>   | 5  | 16                      | 21    | 23.81               |
| <i>peruenīre</i>   | 2  | 4                       | 6     | 33.33               |
| Total <i>aduenīre</i> + <i>ēuenīre</i> +<br><i>peruenīre</i> | 8  | 33                      | 41    | 19.51               |

Only in the case of *ēuenīre* can I say that the special *ā*-subjunctive is productive. This is confirmed by the fact that there is also one token of *ēuenāt* in Enn. *scaen.* 170 and one in Pompon. *Atell.* 35. *Venīre* itself has 87 regular subjunctives in Plautus, and *anteuenīre*, *conuenīre*, *dēuenīre*, *interuenīre*, *inuenīre*, *obuenīre*, *prōuenīre*, *reuenīre*, and *subuenīre* together have 52 regular subjunctives, which yields a total of 139. If the extra-paradigmatic *ā*-formation had only the average frequency for these verbs, 3.29% of special *ā*-forms next to 96.71% of regular subjunctives, I should expect a figure of five irregular *ā*-forms besides the regular subjunctives.<sup>14</sup> If for these verbs the ratio of irregular *ā*-forms to regular subjunctives were the same as for *aduenīre*, *ēuenīre*, and *peruenīre*, I should expect 34 special *ā*-subjunctives beside the 139 forms.<sup>15</sup> Is the complete absence of extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctives for *uenīre* and the other compounds in Plautus due to chance? Not necessarily. There are not enough data, but it seems that neither *uenīre* nor every compound of it can form extra-paradigmatic subjunctives. Finally, it is impossible to make any statements about *praeuenīre* because it has no subjunctives at all in Plautus.

<sup>14</sup> As the 139 subjunctives make up 96.71% of a total consisting of extra-paradigmatic *ā*-forms and regular subjunctives, there should be 4.73 *ā*-forms, that is, five tokens.

<sup>15</sup> There are 8 extra-paradigmatic *ā*-forms and 33 present subjunctives of *aduenīre*, *ēuenīre*, and *peruenīre*.  $(139 \times 8)/33 = 33.70$ , that is 34 tokens.

## The Roots in Terence

In Terence, there are only three extra-paradigmatic *ā*-forms, *crēduās* (*Phorm.* 993), *attigās* (*Andr.* 789), and *fuāt* (*Hec.* 610). It is not surprising that these are the forms which survive. *Crēduās* and *attigās* belong to verbs that have disproportionately many extra-paradigmatic *ā*-forms in Plautus. Not only are the special *ā*-forms of *crēdere* common in Plautus, but the verb is also relatively frequent in Terence (36 regular subjunctives). Irregular *ā*-forms of *dare* are much rarer in Plautus, so even though the verb is frequent in Terence (58 regular subjunctives), the absence of extra-paradigmatic *ā*-forms comes as no surprise: they could have died out. Since *perdere* presumably cannot form special *ā*-subjunctives in Plautus, there is no reason to expect any beside the 10 regular subjunctives in Terence. *Reddere* has 11 regular subjunctives in Terence, *addere* has three, and *dēdere* and *prōdere* have one each; this means that the verbs are so rare that no extra-paradigmatic *ā*-forms can be expected, and it is impossible to tell if Terence would have used such forms had he written more. The other compounds of *dare* in Terence, *abdere*, *ēdere*, *obdere*, *subdere*, and *uendere*, have no subjunctives at all here and must be left aside.

Concerning *tangere* and its compounds, there are not many forms in Terence to begin with. *Tangere* itself has five regular subjunctives in Terence, and *optingere* has four. *Contingere* has no present subjunctives, but one perfect subjunctive (*contigerint* in *Phorm.* 845), while *attingere* has no regular subjunctives at all. There are no other compounds of this verb in Terence and, as in Plautus, the small number of regular forms means that the lack of extra-paradigmatic forms apart from the one token of *attigās* may be due to chance.

There are fewer tokens of *fuāt* in Plautus than we might have expected, but the overall number of extra-paradigmatic forms is relatively high (22 tokens) because *esse* itself is so frequent (980 regular subjunctives in Plautus and 377 in Terence). Thus it is natural that one token of *fuāt* should have survived in Terence. The compounds of *esse* cannot be expected to have extra-paradigmatic *ā*-forms in Terence because they are rare for the most part: *deesse*, which has *dēfuāt* in Plautus, has only two regular subjunctives in Terence; *posse* has 66 regular subjunctives, but does not form extra-paradigmatic

forms as early as Plautus; *abesse*, *adesse*, *inesse*, *interesse*, *obesse*, and *prōdesse* together have a mere 22 regular subjunctives in Terence; consequently it is unclear whether they can form extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctives: they are not frequent enough. This is equally true of *confore* (again, the present infinitive is not attested) and *superesse*, which have no subjunctives at all in Terence.

The roots *uen-* and *tul-* do not have extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctives in Terence. In the case of *uen-* this may partly be fortuitous because most of the regular forms are not particularly frequent: *aduenīre*, *ēuenīre*, and *peruenīre*, which have special *ā*-subjunctives in Plautus, together just have fourteen regular subjunctives in Terence. The 42 regular subjunctives of *uenīre*, *conuenīre*, *interuenīre*, and *inuenīre* have no extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctives beside them; in Plautus, these verbs are frequent, but have no special *ā*-forms either, so the absence of such irregular subjunctives need not be due to chance in Terence. The status of the other two compounds of *uenīre* in Terence, *circumuenīre* and *dēuenīre*, is unclear because they have no subjunctives at all.

With regard to *tul-*, the absence of extra-paradigmatic *ā*-forms may also be fortuitous since the regular forms are comparatively rare. *Auferre*, which has one special *ā*-subjunctive in Plautus, has only five regular subjunctives in Terence. It seems that *ferre* cannot have extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctives in Plautus (but cf. *tulāt* in Acc. *trag.* 102), so the absence of such forms in Terence is natural, even though the verb is not infrequent (fifteen regular subjunctives). I cannot say much about the other verbs. *Differre* and *tollere* each have one present subjunctive in Terence, but the verbs are not attested in Plautus. Since they are so rare, it is unclear whether they can have special *ā*-subjunctives. *Afferre*, *cōnferre*, and *rēfferre* together have thirteen regular subjunctives in Terence; *efferre*, *offerre*, and *sufferre* have one present subjunctive each in Terence; and *attollere*, *rēfferre*, and *trānsferre* are attested in Terence, but have no subjunctives at all. All these verbs occur in Plautus, and all of them (except for *trānsferre*) also have regular subjunctives in Plautus, but no irregular *ā*-forms. The fact that none of these verbs has special *ā*-forms in Plautus is presumably not just due to chance: it seems that at least some of them cannot form extra-paradigmatic subjunctives. This is probably also true of Terence, but here the regular forms are rare

as well, so it is impossible to guess for what verbs the absence of extra-paradigmatic *ā*-forms is due to chance and what verbs cannot have them because the formation is unproductive.

## REGISTER

Forms that are dying out are often restricted to the more formal registers. Is this also true of the extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctives? I shall again look at the distribution of the forms over *cantica* and *senarii* in Plautus, even though the weaknesses of this approach should by now be apparent.<sup>16</sup> In *cantica*, we are supposed to find elements of the elevated style simply because the verses were sung or recited rather than spoken. In *senarii*, on the other hand, such elements normally occur only for special reasons, for example when the passage in question is a prayer. The proportion of *cantica* to *senarii* is 3 : 1 in Plautus, and stylistically neutral forms should be distributed accordingly. Forms belonging to a higher register should be even more frequent in *cantica*, or the forms in *senarii* should be confined to marked passages like prayers. In Plautus, twenty-seven of the forty-five extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctives are in *cantica* and seventeen in *senarii* (one token is in a fragment whose context and metre cannot be recovered). This is a proportion of 3 : 2 rather than of 3 : 1, so there are more forms in *senarii* than one might have expected. Clearly, as in previous chapters, the metrical criterion alone does not establish anything since morphological archaisms are unlikely to be more typical of ordinary language than of passages in a higher register. If the extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctives belong to an elevated level of style, one would think that at least the majority of the seventeen tokens in *senarii* occurred in marked passages. This is indeed the case for all of them. We find them in:

1. an introductory scene (*Curc.* 39);
2. a prayer formula (*Trin.* 41) and conditional curses directed against oneself, 'if I do not do *x*, may everything bad happen

<sup>16</sup> For the different kinds of metre and their supposed influence on register see the introduction to this book.

- to me' (*Bacch.* 504: with a *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*-joke; *Bacch.* 847: with special pomp); *Poen.* 747 is a parody of such a curse;
3. moralizing soliloquies (*Pseud.* 1029 and 1030,<sup>17</sup> *Trin.* 594) and moralizing old men giving advice (*Pseud.* 432, *Trin.* 93); compare Ex. 1:

(1) (An old man is drawing distinctions between different categories of friends.)

Edepol hau dicam dolō:  
sunt quōs scio esse amīcōs, sunt quōs suspicōr,  
sunt quōrum ingenia atque animōs nequeō nōscere  
ad amīcī partem an ad inimīcī *peruenant*. (*Trin.* 90–3.)

By Pollux, I'll tell you openly: there are people whom I know to be friends, there are those whom I suspect to be friends, and there are those whose hearts and minds I cannot read so that I could tell whether they *are inclined to assume* the role of friend or foe.

4. other highly marked passages (*Aul.* 405: the line is just before there is the climax of act iii sc. i, *Bacch.* 156: a tutor is drawing a mythical comparison,<sup>18</sup> *Bacch.* 1033: formal letter of a son pretending to be sorry for his misdemeanour<sup>19</sup> and promising to mend his ways, *Mil.* 492: a stylized passage that forms the climax of act ii,<sup>20</sup> *Mil.* 595: 'officialese', an old man compares a meeting to a session of the senate in l. 594, *Most.* 468: a slave is striving for dramatic effects because he is trying to frighten his master and fellow-slaves, *Poen.* 1085: Hanno has found his nephew).<sup>21</sup>

It is likely that most of these passages are in a higher register. If so, the fact that our forms seem to prefer such contexts over more neutral

<sup>17</sup> In the same passage there is also the high-register sigmatic form *capsit* (l. 1022).

<sup>18</sup> In l. 158, his young master says *satis historiārumst*, 'that's enough of the stories', which indicates that he regards his teacher's words as boring, but maybe also as stylized.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. also *pudēt prōdīre me ad te in cōspectum, pater*, 'I am ashamed to come into your view, father', in l. 1007.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. the many figures of speech, e.g. in *rēctā... rēctam uiam*, 'directly... the direct route' (l. 491) or *Sceledre... scelerum caput*, 'Sceledrus... you source of misdeeds' (l. 494).

<sup>21</sup> Cf. also the use of the sigmatic *faxim* in ll. 1091 and 1093.

senarii is probably not due to chance, but could indicate that they themselves had an archaic air in Plautus' time. This will also be true of the tokens in Terence, who has only three of them.

The twenty tokens from sources other than Plautus and Terence do not contradict this finding. Twelve of the forms occur in tragedy, where high register is common regardless of the metre. *Tulāt* and *attulāt* are attested in Acc. *trag.* 102 and Pacuu. *trag.* 228; *ēuenāt* occurs in Enn. *scaen.* 170; forms of *tangere* and *attingere* can be seen in Acc. *trag.* 304 and Pacuu. *trag.* 165, 228; and we find *fuās* and *fuāt* in Enn. *scaen.* 142, Liu. Andr. *trag.* 23, Pacuu. *trag.* 116, and Trag. inc. 122 and 148. Five tokens can be seen in fragments of comedies. Two of them are in cantica, *fuās* in Afran. *com.* 280 and *attigās* in Turpil. *com.* 106; two are in senarii without sufficient context to allow a stylistic analysis: *fuam* in Titin. *com.* 33 and *ēuenāt* in Pompon. *Atell.* 35; and one token in Novius is so fragmentary that even its metre must remain unclear: *fuam*, *Atell.* 87. Since legal language is more formal, the form in the *plēbiscitum* of M. Plaetorius, cited in Cens. 24. 3, could belong to a higher register. The two inscriptions on lamps (*CIL* i<sup>2</sup>. 499, 500) do not seem to be intended as formal, but contain the prohibition *nē attigās*, which in Plautus is more common than *nē attigerīs*.

## TEMPORAL REFERENCE AND SPECIAL FEATURES

According to Jasanoff (1991: 87 n. 7), Archaic Latin *attigās* and *aduenās* stand for the classical present subjunctives *attingās* and *adueniās*.<sup>22</sup> Rix takes a slightly different view: he does say that synchronically *tagam* belongs to the Archaic Latin present *tagō* (1977: 150 n. 2), and that such forms are merely metrical variants of the regular present subjunctives in the first and third persons (1998b: 258);<sup>23</sup> nevertheless, he argues that the formation goes back to a Proto-Italic category 'preventive' (1998b: 262), and that this can still be seen in the use of the second person. However, the prohibitions

<sup>22</sup> See also Gippert (1999: 125), who states that *fuam* is synonymous with *siem*.

<sup>23</sup> Metrical reasons are not sufficient for explaining *fuam* and *fuāt* instead of *siem* and *siēt*; the forms scan in exactly the same way.

containing such extra-paradigmatic  $\bar{a}$ -subjunctives are not always described as preventive; Ammann (1927: 339) regards the type *nē duās* as inhibitive. Even if Ammann were right concerning Archaic Latin, though, no such claim could be made for Proto-Italic. The inscription which Rix (1998b) discusses, and which was found in the territory of the *Hernīcī*, must be a preventive prohibition. *Ni hvidas* (= [*fidās*], cf. Latin *findere*) written on the vessel has to mean ‘do not break’ rather than ‘stop breaking’.

How can we find out whether the extra-paradigmatic  $\bar{a}$ -forms really function like present subjunctives? We could ask ourselves what regular forms could substitute for them. Given the limited productivity of these extra-paradigmatic forms, this is a reasonable question: not every verb can have special  $\bar{a}$ -subjunctives, and those verbs that do not have such forms must employ regular ones instead. In main clauses, we find the extra-paradigmatic  $\bar{a}$ -forms for example in wishes with future reference, where they could only be replaced by present subjunctives. However, they occur in second-person prohibitions as well, where they alternate not only with present subjunctives, but also with non-past perfect subjunctives, as was discussed in Ch. 4. The extra-paradigmatic  $\bar{a}$ -subjunctive can be co-ordinated with a prohibitive perfect form:

(2) (An old man tells his son not to give a slave girl from abroad to his mother.)

*Nē duās neu te aduēxisse dīxerīs.* (Merc. 401–2.)

*Don't give her, and don't say that you brought her here.*

In this example, *duās* is co-ordinated with the perfect subjunctive *dīxerīs*, not with a present form *dīcās*. Since Ex. 2 is prohibitive, *duās* and *dīxerīs* both have non-past reference.

In third-person prohibitions, perfect subjunctives are very rare, while the present subjunctive is the normal tense. Extra-paradigmatic  $\bar{a}$ -subjunctives occur twice in Plautus:

(3) (Mercury is playing a *seruos currēns*.)

Concēdite atque apscēdite omnēs, dē uīā dēcēdite,  
nec quisquam tām āuidāx fuāt homō qui obuīam opsistāt mihi.  
(*Amph.* 984–5.)

Get away, get out, all of you, get off the street, *and let no one be* so bold as to stand in my way.

*Fuāt* could be replaced by *siēt*. The parallelism to the present imperatives does not mean much because there is a difference in person. The token in Turpilius' *Leucadia* may be a parallel; in Nonius (p. 106. 25–6) the passage is cited as *nē me attigāt! Atque aufer manum!*, 'let him not touch me! And take off your hand!' This would then also be a third-person prohibition with an extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctive combined with a second person imperative. However, Ribbeck prefers the emendation to *nē me attigās, atque aufer manum* (Turpil. *com.* 106–7). This would give us a neat instance of parallelism between a prohibition with an extra-paradigmatic *ā*-form and the present imperative *aufer*. It is unclear if the emendation is correct. All manuscripts have *atiga* or *attiga*, which would of course allow either *attigās* or *attigāt*, but the citation of these verses immediately follows Nonius' explanation *attigat contingat*.

Two tokens are in clauses that are ambiguous between wishes and prohibitions. In *Bacch.* 504, there is a third person, *crēduāt*. Regardless of whether this is a wish or a prohibition, the form could only be replaced by a present subjunctive, not by a perfect form. In *Asin.* 854, on the other hand, there is a second person, *accrēduās*. If this should be analysed as a wish, only the present *accrēdās* could replace the form, but if it is a prohibition, either the present or the perfect subjunctive could substitute for it.

In Trag. inc. 122 we find one special *ā*-subjunctive in a potential question, *dubium id an cuiquam fuāt?*, 'would this be doubtful to anyone?' Here *fuāt* could only be replaced by the present subjunctive *siēt*.

In the clause types discussed so far, the irregular *ā*-subjunctives could always be replaced by present subjunctives. However, under certain conditions the perfect subjunctives can also take on the role of the special *ā*-forms. This is regularly the case where the perfect subjunctives have preserved their old non-past meaning. The perfect subjunctives with past force cannot substitute for the extra-paradigmatic *ā*-forms. Thus the *ā*-forms could function like present subjunctives, or their meaning could oscillate between that of present and special perfect subjunctives. This preliminary result does not change if we look at other clause types. We also find extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctives in the phrase *fors fuāt (an)*, in which only *sit* occurs in Classical Latin, thus replacing *fuāt*. If *fuāt* is more than part of a fossilized idiom here, it is a potential subjunctive. Its reference is

non-past, like that of *sīt* or potential, non-past *fuērīt*. This is why it selects a subordinate present subjunctive in *Pseud.* 432.

Elsewhere, extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctives also take primary sequence (for the sequence rules of Archaic Latin see Ch. 3):

(4) (A pimp is threatening an insolent slave.)

Cauē sīs me *attigās*, *nē* tibi hōc scīpiōne  
malum magnum *dem.* (*Persa* 816–17.)

Don't *touch* me, please, *so that* I *don't* give you a good beating with this stick.

*Attigās* is in a prohibition and thus cannot have past reference. Consequently the *nē*-clause it takes is in the present subjunctive. We saw another example of primary sequence in Ex. 3 above. Similarly, the relative clause *quod loquantur*, 'what they are talking', in *Poen.* 747 has attraction of mood and depends on an extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctive. Again, this is an instance of primary sequence. However, cases like these merely show that the irregular *ā*-subjunctives are not past; they do not force a present tense interpretation.

In those cases where the special *ā*-subjunctives themselves depend on regular verb forms, these regular forms are never past, and the *ā*-subjunctives never refer to the past either. We can see this in subordinate *ut*- and *nē*-clauses and also in the one *priusquam*-clause in Plautus that contains such an irregular *ā*-subjunctive (*Rud.* 626).<sup>24</sup> Subjunctival relative clauses behave in the same way.<sup>25</sup> Exx. 5 and 6 contain *nē*-clauses:

(5) (Lydus' former student has compared himself to Hercules and his tutor to Linus, which amounts to a threat; Lydus is now issuing a threat himself, comparing himself to Hercules' former tutor Phoenix.)

<sup>24</sup> Note also *utinam mortem oppetam prius quam ēuenāt quod...gemam*, 'may I die before something happens for which...I might groan', in *Enn. scaen.* 170–1. The main clause verb *oppetam* is a present subjunctive and selects the extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctive *ēuenāt*; *ēuenāt* could only be replaced by a present form and in turn takes primary sequence, as *gemam* shows.

<sup>25</sup> Apart from the example in the preceding footnote, there is one token in *Merc.* 844: *est quī...fuāt*, 'there is someone who...might be.' Similarly, the comparative clause *quam...crēduam*, 'than...I might believe', in *Poen.* 747 depends on a main clause in the present subjunctive.

Pol metuō magis nē Phoenix tūis factis fuam  
tēque ad patrem esse mortuom renūntiem. (Bacch. 156–7.)

By Pollux, I *am* more afraid that I *should be* a Phoenix because of your actions, and that I should report your death to your father.

(6) Perii hercle uērō! Tiberī, nunc tēcum opsecrō  
ut mihi subueniās nē egō maiālis fuam. (Titin. com. 32–3.)

By Hercules, it's all over with me! Tiberius, now I ask you to *come* to my assistance so that I *don't become* a gelded boar!

In Ex. 5 the main clause verb *metuō* is in the present and must have primary sequence. Thus *fuam* could be replaced by a present subjunctive. This analysis is confirmed by the fact that *fuam* is co-ordinated with the present subjunctive *renūntiem*. Similarly, the sequence rules would only allow us to replace *fuam* by a present subjunctive in Ex. 6. *Nē*-clauses with irregular forms after non-past verbs can also be found in Pacuu. *trag.* 116, *mandāt nē...fuāt*, 'he orders that...he should not be', and in Pacuu. *trag.* 228, *custōdīte..., nē...attulāt nēue attigāt*, 'guard him..., lest...he should bring or touch.' *Opsecrō tē...nē...fuās*, 'I beseech you...not...to be', in Liu. Andr. *trag.* 23 may belong here as well, but alternatively the *nē*-clause could be an independent prohibition. After non-past verb forms we also find one *quīn*-clause and one *ut*-clause: *uetāt quīn attulāt* 'he forbids to bring' (Pacuu. *trag.* 41–2) and *exposco ut...fuāt* 'I demand that...it should be' (Enn. *scaen.* 142).

In indirect questions, there is normally a periphrastic *-ūrus*-subjunctive in classical Latin if the clause is posterior to its main clause. Such a periphrastic form might be expected in the next example:

(7) (An old man is not impressed by a cook's threats.)

Pol ego hau sciō quid post fuāt. (Aul. 426.)

By Pollux, I *do not know what will be* later on.

A classical author would have written *futūrum sit*. This does not mean, however, that such extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctives are equivalent to periphrastic futures. In Ch. 3 I argued that the periphrastic subjunctives are still rare in indirect questions in Archaic

Latin, where the present subjunctive is normally used. Here Plautus could also have said *siēt*.<sup>26</sup>

Problems of interpretation arise when *nē*-clauses with extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctives in the second person are ambiguous between subordinate clauses and independent prohibitions; I have discussed such problems in Ch. 4. Such ambiguities occur twice in Plautus, in *Capt.* 443 and in *Trin.* 266–8. In the former case, the *nē*-clause is ambiguous between an object clause and a prohibition, in the latter, between a final clause and a prohibition. If the clauses were independent prohibitions, replacement by perfect and present subjunctives would be allowed, both with non-past meaning. If they were subordinate clauses, the sequence of tenses would show that they are like present subjunctives dependent on non-past verbs; replacement by perfect subjunctives would be impossible.

We have similar problems in the case of *cauē* without *nē* and with extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctives in the second person. As I argued in Ch. 4, *cauē* may or may not be verbal here. In the next two examples it could be either:

(8) (Tyndarus tells Philocrates not to be offended because he has admonished him.)

Atque hōrunc uerbōrum caussā *cauē* tū mi īrātus *fuās*. (*Capt.* 431.)

And *don't be angry* with me because of these words.

(9) Age age āmōlīre, āmitte! *Cauē* uestem *attigās*! (*Acc. trag.* 304.)

Come on, come on, move off, let go! *Don't touch* the clothing!

In these examples, *cauē* may be deverbilized because of the absence of *nē*, but it is equally possible that it is still fully verbal. If *cauē* is deverbilized, we do not learn much about the tense of the special *ā*-subjunctives, which could be replaced by non-past perfect or present forms. If *cauē* is still verbal, the sequence rules demand that the *ā*-forms should be like present subjunctives. Since the status of *cauē* is unclear wherever it is combined with irregular *ā*-subjunctives, these

<sup>26</sup> An indirect question with past reference dependent on an extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctive should be in the perfect if the *ā*-form has non-past reference; this is indeed the case, cf. *quid meritis hic sīt, dubium id an cuiquam fuāt?*, 'would it be doubtful to anyone what he has incurred?' (*Trag. inc.* 122).

constructions are not very helpful for determining the tense and aspect of the subjunctive forms.<sup>27</sup>

Similarly, parallelism to other directive expressions does not help when we are dealing with *cauē* + extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctive. Since *cauē* may be verbal, the other directive expressions may be parallel to the imperative *cauē* on its own rather than to a complex of deverbalized *cauē* (roughly equivalent to *nē*) + subjunctive as a whole.<sup>28</sup> But even in prohibitions with *nē*, parallelism to non-subjunctival directives is no great help.<sup>29</sup>

In other instances, however, parallelism and co-ordination are reliable means of finding out about tense and aspect. We have already seen co-ordination with a non-past, prohibitive perfect subjunctive in Ex. 2, and with a present subjunctive in Ex. 5. Ex. 10 is another instance of co-ordination:

(10) (An old man is sending his wife off.)

Vxōr, uenerāre ut nōbīs haec habitātiō

bona, fausta, fēlix fortūnātaque ēuenāt—

tēque ut quam primum possim uideam ēmortuam. (*Trin.* 40–2.)

My dear, pray that this home of ours *becomes* good, blessed, happy, and fortunate—and that I *see* you dead as soon as possible.

Here the extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctive is co-ordinated with a regular present subjunctive. This points to temporal equivalence. Pompon. *Atell.* 35–6 is similar; one speaker says *bene ēuenāt*, ‘may it turn out well’, and the other replies *ita sīt*, ‘may it be like this’ (or *ita fīāt*, ‘may it become like this’, if we follow Ribbeck).

Not quite like the other instances of parallelism are cases in which a conditional protasis and apodosis have the same tense. There are only two secure instances in which extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctives

<sup>27</sup> In *Bacch.* 1033, we find *cauē*...*fuant*. Even if *cauē* were deverbalized here, *fuant* could in all likelihood only be replaced by *sient*, not by *fuierint*. The reason is that this is a 3rd pers.

<sup>28</sup> The following imperatives may be parallel to *cauē* alone or to the combination *cauē* + special *ā*-subjunctive: *cūra atque abdūce* (*Bacch.* 1031), *cōgitātō* (*Capt.* 432), *recipe* (*Persa* 51), and *age age āmōlire, āmitte* (Ex. 9 above).

<sup>29</sup> In *Epid.* 723, the reply to *ne attigās* is *ostende uērō*. In *Most.* 468, *aedīs ne attigātis* is followed by *tangite*. But prohibitions and commands may follow different constraints.

occur in conditional clauses and present subjunctives occur in the main clauses:<sup>30</sup>

(11) (A pauper does not want his rich neighbour to marry his daughter.)

Vbi onus *nequeam* ferre pariter, *iaceam* ego asinus in lutō,  
tū mē bōs magis hau *respiciās* gnātus quasi numquam siem.  
Et te *ūtār* inīquiōrē, et meus me ōrdo *irrideāt*,  
neutrubi *habeam* stabile stabulum, sī quid dīuortī *fuāt*:  
asinī mē mordicibus *scindant*, bouēs *incursent* cornibus. (Aul. 230–4.)

When I *couldn't* carry my burden like you, I, the donkey, *would be cast down* in the mud. You, the ox, *wouldn't look* at me any more than if I'd never been born. I *would not have* you as my equal, and my own class *would laugh* at me. On neither side *would I be* on firm ground if there *should be* a divorce: the donkeys *would tear* me into pieces with their teeth, and the oxen *would attack* me with their horns.

(12) *Nisī* quid tua facultās *tulāt* opem, *peream*. (Acc. *trag.* 102.)

If your skill *did not bring* me help, I *would perish*.

In Ex. 11, all the main clauses are apodoses and contain present subjunctives. The conditional clause contains the form *fuāt*, and the *ubi*-clause, which is parallel to the conditional clause, has the present subjunctive. In Ex. 12, protasis and apodosis are probably unreal. There are two more instances of *fuāt* in Plautine conditional clauses: in *Capt.* 260, there are two conditional clauses, but they are not parallel; one contains the present subjunctive, the other *fuāt*. The main clause itself has *aequomst uitiō uortere* 'it is right to regard it as a fault' as its predicate. The other token of *fuāt* is in *Poen.* 1085; the main clause is in the future. Outside Plautus we find *cauē nē pendeās sī fuās in quaestione* 'take care you aren't strung up if you're the object of search' (*Afran. com.* 279–80). There is one instance where the main clause contains an extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctive and the protasis, a present subjunctive: *sī quis . . . immolēt, . . . dubium id an cuiquam fuāt?*, 'if anyone . . . should sacrifice, . . . would it be doubtful to anyone?' (*Trag. inc.* 120–2).

<sup>30</sup> In *at nōn cernam nisī tagam* (*Pacuu. trag.* 165) it is unclear whether *cernam* is future or subjunctive; on subjunctival protases with future apodoses see Nutting (1926), who distinguishes several subtypes, e.g. subjunctival protases accompanied by apodoses containing modal futures.

There are two tokens where *fuāt* functions like an auxiliary and is combined with the perfect passive participle. Ex. 13 is one of them:

(13) (Stratippocles tries to cheer up Epidicus, who is on the run.)

*Stratippocles*: Ego tē seruābo. *Epidicus*: Edepol me illī melius sī nānctī *fuant*.  
(*Epid.* 619.)

*Stratippocles*: I shall watch over you. *Epidicus*: By Pollux, they will keep me under lock and key if they *should* have got hold of me.

The apodosis is in the future (*seruābunt*, to be supplied from *seruābō*), while the protasis is in the subjunctive. *Sient* could substitute for *fuant*. However, sometimes the perfect passive subjunctive is formed with the past participle and the perfect subjunctive of the copula, for instance in *Trin.* 850 (*nātus... fuerīt*), so that it is conceivable that *fuant* could be replaced by *fuerint*. But since the present subjunctive is more frequent in such periphrastic constructions, I should expect *sient* rather than *fuerint*.

As can be seen from the examples so far, replacement of extra-paradigmatic *ā*-forms by present subjunctives is always possible. Replacement by perfect subjunctives is allowed in speech acts in which the perfect subjunctives have preserved their old non-past meaning. Yet wherever the perfect subjunctives have past meaning, they cannot substitute for the irregular *ā*-forms. The conclusion must be that the extra-paradigmatic *ā*-forms are non-past subjunctives, either equivalent to present subjunctives or oscillating between present and perfect subjunctives. The temporal adverbials with which the *ā*-forms are combined do not contradict this finding, even though they do not offer much positive evidence either. *Numquam* in *Bacch.* 504 and *umquam* in *Bacch.* 847 and in *Pacuu. trag.* 116–17 are very unspecific, and so is the ablative absolute *captā praedā* in *Pseud.* 1029, which is anterior to the extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctive. But *post* in *Aul.* 426, *posthāc* in *Asin.* 854 and *Poen.* 747, and *prius quam... abierit*, ‘before... he shall have left’, in *Pseud.* 1031 seem to indicate that the *ā*-forms have future reference. Similarly, *sī... inuēnerīs*, ‘if... you shall have found’, in *Asin.* 855 and *nī... faxō... nīue... fēcerō*, ‘if I shall not have done or if I shall not have made’, in *Bacch.* 848–9 point in the same direction. On the other hand, the *dum*-clause (‘while’) in

*Mil.* 595 has an atemporal present indicative and cannot tell us much, even if we accept the corrupt line as it stands.

Since the extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctives always have non-past reference, I can now examine whether prohibitions containing such *ā*-forms have special features such as inhibitive or preventive (these concepts are discussed in Ch. 4). There are six relevant unambiguous prohibitions in Plautus, but there is only one in Terence; besides, there is one unambiguous prohibition in Nouius *Atell.* 87 and one in *Trag. inc.* 148. I shall restrict myself to these, even though in Plautus there are also two examples that are ambiguous between prohibitions and subordinate *ne*-clauses, and four instances of *cauē* with these special forms.<sup>31</sup> This means that we are left with nine true and unambiguous prohibitions, not a large number to begin with. Moreover, the verb used is *attigās/attigātis* in five of these nine cases, and in three it is *fuās/fuāt*; the ninth example is *nē duās*. This restriction to three verbs makes it difficult to see whether a certain interpretation of the prohibitions is due to the specific form or to the lexical value of the verbs involved:

(14) (A tutor is complaining about unfair treatment: if a tutor has been beaten by his master's son, the father will praise his son and warn the tutor.)

Prōuocātur paedagōgus: 'eho senex minimī pretī,  
ne attigās puerum istāc caussā, quandō fēcīt strēnuē.' (*Bacch.* 444–5.)

They call the tutor: 'Hey, you worthless old man, *don't touch* the boy for this because he acted with determination.'

This is a threat issued to the tutor, who has approached the father; he has not yet smacked the son. Consequently the threat *ne attigās* must be interpreted as preventive, 'don't touch' rather than 'stop touching'. However, the preventive interpretation may be the natural consequence of using the verb *attingere*: *attingere* is not only telic, but also momentaneous. The English 'touch' is ambiguous in this respect: it may be momentaneous like the Latin *attingere*, which means something like 'get hold of', or it may be stative like Latin *tangere*, 'be in touch with'. It is hard to see how a momentaneous event could

<sup>31</sup> The two ambiguous *nē*-clauses must be left aside in the discussion of prohibitions since we might get a wrong picture if they were intended as subordinate. The tokens with *cauē* cannot be considered either: if *cauē* is verbal, only preventive, not inhibitive interpretation is possible because of the lexical meaning of *cauē*.

be prohibited inhibitive because then it would have to be ongoing. This would only be possible if the action were iterative, which is not the case here. So all the examples of *ne attigās* have to be interpreted as being preventive.

There are three unambiguous prohibitions with *nē fuāt*. The base verb *esse* is stative.<sup>32</sup> If an event is a state, it may be forbidden either preventively or inhibitive. Ex. 15 (= Ex. 3 above) is clearly preventive:

(15) (Mercury is playing the *seruos currēns*.)

Concēdite atque apscēdite omnēs, dē uīā dēcēdite,  
nec quisquam tām āuidāx *fuāt* hōmō qui obuīam opsistāt mihi.  
(*Amph.* 984–5.)

Get away, get out, all of you, get off the street, *and let no one be* so bold as to stand in my way.

This is in one of those speeches issued before a slave begins to look for his master. Consequently there is no possibility of interpreting this prohibition inhibitive (‘and no one shall go on to be so daring as to ...’).

The next example can also be interpreted preventively, although it is not so straightforward:

(16) (Periphanes has just found out that Acropolistis is not his long-lost daughter, even though she called him father.)

*Periphanes*: Haec negāt sē tuam<sup>33</sup> esse mātrem. *Acropolistis*: *Nē fuāt*  
sī nōn uolt. (*Epid.* 584–5.)

*Periphanes*: She (= Periphanes’ wife) says she’s not your mother. *Acropolistis*: She *needn’t be* if she doesn’t want to.

*Nē fuāt* could have future reference, ‘she need not be my mother (in future)’; but a present inhibitive interpretation is also possible and could be rendered as ‘she need not go on being my mother’.<sup>34</sup>

<sup>32</sup> Indo-European *\*H<sub>1</sub>es-* ‘to be’ is stative, while *\*b<sup>h</sup>weH<sub>x</sub>-* ‘to become’ is telic. (See Ch. 3 for these concepts.) In Latin, however, the *fu*-forms associated with *esse* normally also mean ‘to be’, cf. *fuī* ‘I was’, not ‘I became’. The meaning ‘to become’ survives in *fieri*.

<sup>33</sup> We should probably elide completely or scan *tw(am)* *esse* rather than assume iambic shortening of the type *tū(am)* *ēsse*.

<sup>34</sup> Note that in this example future reference may also be combined with an inhibitive nuance.

The present inhibitive interpretation presupposes that Acropolistis had claimed before that Periphanes' wife was her mother; she may have done so, but she has never seen her. In fact, she sees her for the first time in this scene. For this reason, it seems more likely that Ex. 16 ought to be interpreted as having future rather than present reference.<sup>35</sup>

With regard to politeness, the prohibitions containing extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctives seem to be neutral. In Ex. 14, *ne attigās* is anything but polite: a master is threatening his servant, whom he calls *senex minimī pretī*, 'worthless old man'. *Nē fuāt* in Ex. 16 is permissive, 'she need not be', rather than a strict prohibition, as the conditional clause *sī nōn uolt* shows. Permissives are normally polite, but Ex. 16 appears to be rude. What makes the girl's statement insolent is the fact that she, being a subordinate, behaves as if she were in a position to give permissions. *Dōtem ad nōs nūllam attulās* in Nouius *Atell.* 87 is probably polite because it is permissive, 'you need not bring any dowry to us'; after all, it is the addressee who benefits.

To conclude, the extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctives have non-past reference like present subjunctives or the perfect subjunctives used in prohibitions and potential statements. The few prohibitions with irregular *ā*-subjunctives are preventive rather than inhibitive, but the small number of tokens makes it impossible to tell whether this is due to chance or whether inhibitive interpretation is excluded for other reasons.

## DISTRIBUTION OVER CLAUSE TYPES

Are the extra-paradigmatic *ā*-forms closer to present subjunctives or the non-past perfect subjunctives in prohibitions and toned-down statements? Since there are no differences in temporal reference, we cannot find out by using the replacement tests employed in the previous section. However, despite having the same time reference, present

<sup>35</sup> The token in Trag. inc. 148 is unclear because we have no context: *religentem esse oportēt, religiōsus nē fuās*, 'one should be devout, but don't be superstitious.' *Nē fuās* could mean either 'don't be in the future' or 'stop being'. The former possibility is more likely if we are dealing with a general injunction.

and non-past perfect subjunctives may prefer different clause types. We should examine these patterns of distribution in Plautus and Terence in order to see if the irregular  $\bar{a}$ -forms are associated with presents or perfects. Ideally, this should be a three-way comparison between special  $\bar{a}$ -forms, present subjunctives, and non-past perfect subjunctives. However, the verbs with extra-paradigmatic  $\bar{a}$ -forms in these two authors merely have five non-past perfect subjunctives there: *dederim* in *Epid.* 258 is in a potential statement, and *attigeris* in *Persa* 793 and *fueris* in *Asin.* 839–40, *Aul.* 618, *Epid.* 595 are in prohibitions. Thus it is best to compare the irregular  $\bar{a}$ -forms and the present subjunctives of the same verbs, and to look at non-past perfect subjunctives only if we find distinctions between the  $\bar{a}$ -forms and the present subjunctives. These comparisons might also help us in other respects: it was claimed by Rix (1998*b*) and by Meiser (2003: 41–2) that the extra-paradigmatic  $\bar{a}$ -subjunctives go back to Proto-Italic preventives and that they are, as a consequence, particularly frequent in prohibitions and subordinate  $n\bar{e}$ -clauses. In this section, I shall examine whether the second claim is correct; I have already shown in de Melo (2004*a*) that the first cannot be upheld.

As the extra-paradigmatic  $\bar{a}$ -forms are more productive in main clauses, I shall look at main and subordinate clauses separately. I shall take the tokens governed by *cauē* as main clause prohibitions and look at the auxiliaries under the subordinate clauses. In Tables 10.5–7, there are not always whole numbers. The reason for this is that I split up those clauses which are ambiguous, so that for example  $n\bar{e}$ -clauses which could be prohibitive or subordinate are divided between the two categories. Two irregular forms in Plautus are ambiguous between prohibitions and wishes, and two might be either prohibitions or subordinate  $n\bar{e}$ -clauses. Among the regular forms in Plautus, one is ambiguous between a command and a wish, another one is ambiguous between a command and an object clause, and 21 could be either prohibitions or subordinate  $n\bar{e}$ -clauses. In Terence, two regular forms are ambiguous between (positive) wishes and subordinate clauses, and one token is ambiguous between a prohibition and a subordinate  $n\bar{e}$ -clause.

The distribution of forms in Plautine main clauses can be seen in Table 10.5. In total, there are 21 extra-paradigmatic  $\bar{a}$ -forms with 151 present tense counterparts in Plautus. The ratio 21 : 151 corresponds

TABLE 10.5. The distribution of forms over main clauses in Plautus

|  | Extra-<br>paradigmatic<br><i>ā</i> -subjunctives | Present<br>subjunctives | Total | <i>ā</i> -forms (%) |
|--|--|-------------------------|-------|---------------------|
| Commands                                 | 0  | 37                      | 37    | 0                   |
| Prohibitions (including<br><i>cauē</i> ) | 16   | 19.5                    | 35.5  | 45.07               |
| Wishes                                   | 4  | 44.5                    | 48.5  | 8.25                |
| Potential statements<br>and questions    | 1  | 50                      | 51    | 1.96                |
| Total                                    | 21   | 151                     | 172   | 12.21               |

*Note:* Two facts should be noted concerning this and the following table. First, among the unambiguous wishes one irregular and one regular form in Plautus are negated. And second, the type *fors fuāt* was counted under potential statements.

to 12.21% and 87.79%. If the irregular *ā*-forms and the present subjunctives were distributed in the same way, these percentages should recur in all main clause types.

As can be seen from the percentages in the different rows, potential statements and questions with irregular *ā*-forms are much rarer than expected in Plautus (1.96% rather than 12.21% of all the statements and questions). The most striking phenomena, however, concern the directives in Plautus. One would expect some special *ā*-forms in commands, but there are none. In prohibitions, the proportion of extra-paradigmatic *ā*-forms is unusually high; the 16 tokens with *-ā* amount to 45.07% instead of 12.21%. Special *ā*-forms of *attingere* are particularly frequent in prohibitions; all its five extra-paradigmatic tokens occur here, which means that this presumably has idiomatic status. But even if these five tokens did not exist, the prohibitions with the *ā*-forms would still be disproportionately frequent.<sup>36</sup>

The distribution of the forms over the main clauses in Terence is presented in Table 10.6. There are 3 extra-paradigmatic *ā*-forms and 36.5 present subjunctives in main clauses, which corresponds to 7.59% and 92.41%; the irregular *ā*-forms are becoming less productive. Again, if the *ā*-forms were just morphologically aberrant present subjunctives, this ratio should recur in all main clause types. There

<sup>36</sup> The likelihood that these patterns in directives are statistically significant is higher than 99.95%, as the t-test shows.

TABLE 10.6. The distribution of forms over main clauses in Terence

|  | Extra-<br>paradigmatic<br><i>ā</i> -subjunctives | Present<br>subjunctives | Total | <i>ā</i> -forms (%) |
|--|--|-------------------------|-------|---------------------|
| Commands                                 | 0  | 3                       | 3     | 0                   |
| Prohibitions (including<br><i>cauē</i> ) | 2  | 3.5                     | 5.5   | 36.36               |
| Wishes                                   | 0  | 8                       | 8     | 0                   |
| Potential statements<br>and questions    | 1  | 22                      | 23    | 4.35                |
| Total                                    | 3  | 36.5                    | 39.5  | 7.59                |

TABLE 10.7. The distribution of forms over subordinate clauses in Plautus

|  | Extra-<br>paradigmatic<br><i>ā</i> -subjunctives | Present<br>subjunctives | Total | <i>ā</i> -forms (%) |
|--|--|-------------------------|-------|---------------------|
| Subordinate <i>ut</i>                      | 1  | 197.5                   | 198.5 | 0.50                |
| Subordinate <i>nē</i>                      | 7  | 75.5                    | 82.5  | 8.48                |
| Conditional clauses                        | 3  | 57                      | 60    | 5                   |
| Indirect questions and<br>relative clauses | 7  | 372                     | 379   | 1.85                |
| Other subordinate clauses                  | 2  | 92                      | 94    | 2.13                |
| Auxiliaries                                | 2  | 112                     | 114   | 1.75                |
| Total                                      | 22   | 906                     | 928   | 2.37                |

*Note:* I have included the 37 regular forms in object clauses without subordinators among the *ut*-clauses (type *uelim dēs*). In the category ‘indirect questions and relative clauses’ there is only one irregular token in a relative clause, but there are 6 in indirect questions. The ‘other subordinate clauses’ with regular forms are *quīn*-clauses (21), causal clauses (3), temporal clauses (28), comparative clauses (30), and limiting clauses (10). The two irregular forms in Plautus are in a temporal and a comparative clause.

are not enough tokens to allow definitive answers, but again we find two of the three *ā*-subjunctives in prohibitions.

Does this anomalous pattern of distribution also have reflexes in the subordinate clauses? Table 10.7 presents the relevant forms in subordinate clauses in Plautus.<sup>37</sup>

<sup>37</sup> There are no irregular *ā*-subjunctives in subordinate clauses in Terence; the regular forms are distributed almost as in Plautus: 65 in *ut*-clauses, 25.5 in *nē*-clauses, 16 in conditional clauses, 141 in indirect questions and relative clauses, and 35 in other subordinate clauses (7 *quīn*-clauses, 3 causal clauses, 11 temporal clauses, 11 comparative clauses, 2 limiting clauses, and 1 thematic *quod*-clause). 41 forms are used as auxiliaries.

TABLE 10.8. The various forms in prohibitions in Plautus and Terence

|  | 2nd pers. | 3rd pers. | Total |
|--|-----------|-----------|-------|
| Present subjunctives                           | 21        | 40        | 61    |
| Perfect, sigmatic, and $\bar{i}$ -subjunctives | 80        | 3         | 83    |
| Extra-paradigmatic $\bar{a}$ -subjunctives     | 12        | 3         | 15    |

*Note:* This table is based on Table 9.6. Among the irregular  $\bar{a}$ -subjunctives, only the unambiguous prohibitions and the tokens with *cauē* have been counted. I have left out of consideration clauses which might be subordinate or which might not be prohibitions, but wishes.

In total, there are 22 irregular  $\bar{a}$ -forms in Plautine subordinate clauses; they have 906 present subjunctive counterparts. This corresponds to 2.37% and 97.63%. This ratio does not recur among all the subordinate clause types. The two clause types that are particularly out of line are the *ut*- and the *nē*-clauses. In *ut*-clauses there is only one special  $\bar{a}$ -form, which amounts to a mere 0.50% of the relevant subjunctives in this clause type; if 2.37% instead of 0.50% of the 198.5 subjunctives in Plautine *ut*-clauses were irregular  $\bar{a}$ -forms, there would be five tokens with  $-\bar{a}$ .<sup>38</sup> In *nē*-clauses there are seven extra-paradigmatic  $\bar{a}$ -forms, which is 8.48% of the tokens in *nē*-clauses instead of the average 2.37%.<sup>39</sup>

We can now see that the extra-paradigmatic  $\bar{a}$ -forms are not distributed like regular present subjunctives. In particular, the  $\bar{a}$ -forms are much rarer in commands and *ut*-clauses and much more frequent in prohibitions and *nē*-clauses. They share this pattern of distribution with the sigmatic forms (Ch. 7) and the  $\bar{i}$ -subjunctives (Ch. 9).

In prohibitions, perfect, sigmatic, and  $\bar{i}$ -subjunctives are rare in the third person. Table 10.8 shows that this is also true of the irregular  $\bar{a}$ -subjunctives, in stark contrast to the present subjunctives.

The third person is freely employed in prohibitions in the present subjunctive. If perfect or sigmatic subjunctives or  $\bar{i}$ -forms are used, it is very rare: there are only three tokens, while the second person clearly predominates here. If extra-paradigmatic  $\bar{a}$ -subjunctives

<sup>38</sup> 2.37% of 198.5 tokens is 4.70, that is, 5 tokens.

<sup>39</sup> The t-test shows that likelihood that these findings concerning *ut*-clauses in Plautus are statistically significant is higher than 99.95%. The likelihood that the pattern concerning Plautine *nē*-clauses is statistically significant is between 99% and 99.5%, as can also be seen from a t-test.

are used in prohibitions, the third person is also relatively rare; the second person is four times as frequent as the third. The special *ā*-subjunctives thus exhibit a pattern of distribution similar to that of perfect and irregular *s*-/*ī*-subjunctives.

To sum up, the extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctives have peculiar patterns of distribution which they share with the sigmatic and the *ī*-subjunctives: they are very rare in commands and *ut*-clauses, but frequent in prohibitions and subordinate *nē*-clauses. Another shared anomaly is the behaviour concerning persons in prohibitions, where all types of extra-paradigmatic subjunctives are far more frequent in the second person than in the third. Rix (1998*b*) has correctly noted some of these anomalies among the irregular *ā*-forms; but only a comparison between them and the *s*- and *ī*-forms can tell us whether it makes sense to speak of *ā*-preventives.<sup>40</sup> All I can say here is that the special *ā*-forms are closer to non-past perfect subjunctives than to the present subjunctives.

## CONCLUSIONS

The extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctives are already rare in Archaic Latin. They are more frequent in main than in subordinate clauses. The forms are restricted to five roots, *du*-, *fu*-, *tag*-, *tul*-, and *uen*-. Not all roots form *ā*-subjunctives equally easily, and among the individual roots there are also differences between the various verbs; *crēdere*, *attingere*, and *ēuenīre* have disproportionately many irregular *ā*-forms in Plautus, and the first two of them also have one token each in Terence. *Fuāt* (the suppletive extra-paradigmatic subjunctive of *esse*) is less productive than average, but since *esse* is such a frequent verb, there are still several tokens in Plautus and one in Terence.

Like many obsolescent forms, the extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctives belong to a higher register.

<sup>40</sup> On this topic see de Melo (2004*a*), where I argue that there are differences between the *ā*-forms on the one hand and the *s*- and *ī*-forms on the other, but that they have to do with the lexical meanings of the verbs in question, not with the *ā*-morph.

My main points of focus were their temporal and aspectual features and their distribution over clause types. It turned out that their temporal features are the same as those of present subjunctives or of non-past perfect subjunctives in prohibitions and potential statements. They have this in common with the sigmatic subjunctives and the *ī*-forms. What is more, the distribution of the *ā*-forms over the various clause types also resembles that of the sigmatic and the *ī*-subjunctives. These similarities were unexpected and are highly significant because they might enable a unitary explanation of all types of extra-paradigmatic subjunctives. In fact, it seems that the irregular *ā*-forms are equivalent to the other extra-paradigmatic subjunctives, which function like old *perfectum* forms that have not acquired past meaning because there is a lack of corresponding past indicatives.<sup>41</sup>

#### A FURTHER ADDENDUM: EXTRA-PARADIGMATIC INDICATIVES?

Initially, I claimed that forms like *attigās* are extra-paradigmatic subjunctives associated with the verb *attingere*. But could it be argued that synchronically they actually form a complete paradigm and belong with an indicative *\*attigīs* and an infinitive *\*attigere*? This is the view taken by Rix (1977: 150 n. 2), who believes that a present indicative *tagō* existed. The sigmatic subjunctives and the type *duīs* have indicative forms beside them. Is this also true of the type *attigās*, and if so, what do these indicatives mean? Since *duīs* and *duās* are formed from the same stem, it could be argued that indicatives like *interduō* are connected with the extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctives as much as with the *ī*-forms. However, apart from these extra-paradigmatic indicatives of *dare* and its compounds, there is hardly any evidence for other special indicatives. Nonius cites a passage from Turpilius in which some editors restore the form *tagō*:

<sup>41</sup> Where there are special *ā*-forms that have the same stem as the perfect, this is presumably due to chance and the result of recent changes. In all likelihood, *attigās* has never had reduplication, while *attigistī* goes back to reduplicated *\*attetigistī*. Similarly, *fuās* always has a short *-ū-* (this seems to be original), whereas *fuistī* originally had a long *-ū-*, cf. *fūimus* in Enn. ann. 377. (In *Capt.* 555 we find both *fūit* and *prōfūit*.)

(17) Tangere etiam circumuenīre. Turpilius Dēmētriō: . . . . Īdem Leucādiā:

Hoc quaero: ignōscere  
istīc solentne eās minōrīs noxiās  
erum sī forte, quasi aliās, rēs uīnī †cauo† (Non. p. 657. 31 + 34–7.)

*Tangere* also means ‘to cheat someone out of something’. Turpilius says in the *Dēmētrius*: . . . . And in the *Leucadia* he writes: ‘I’m asking this: do they usually pardon these minor offences, if I, by chance, †cauo† my master, as at other times, †matters of wine†?’

The passage, written in iambic senarii, is evidently corrupt. *Rēs uīnī tagō* would be unmetrical and ungrammatical. Besides, *tagō* for †cauo† is not the best solution from a purely palaeographic point of view either. Maybe we should follow Lindsay, who reads *erum sī forte, quasi aliās, uīnī cadō* and has *tangam* in the next line; there is no reason why there should be an irregular verb form. The translation would then be ‘if I, by chance, cheat my master out of a jar of wine, as at other times’.

This leaves us with one token from Pacuvius:

(18) ut egō, sī quisquam mē tagit (Pacuu. *trag.* 344).

as I, if anyone *touches* me

Ex. 18 shows that verbs other than *dare* and its compounds can have extra-paradigmatic indicatives, but it must remain unclear what the temporal and aspectual meaning of this form is and whether it is inherited or a backformation from *tagam*. It is highly doubtful if there were any infinitives like *\*attigere*, and it seems that the extra-paradigmatic *ā*-forms share the lack of infinitives, past subjunctives etc. with the types *faxīs* and *duīs*. Synchronically, it does not make sense to assign *tagam* to any verb other than *tangere*, just as it would be odd to argue that *faxīs* belongs with *\*faxere* rather than *facere*.

We have now looked at all the extra-paradigmatic forms attested before 100 BC. The sigmatic futures, subjunctives, and infinitives were the subject of Chs. 6, 7, and 8; Ch. 9 dealt with the *ī*-subjunctives, and the present chapter discussed the *ā*-forms. All these types are of limited productivity. Among the sigmatic futures, only the fossilized *faxō* occurs in main clauses, while there are forms of different verbs in all persons and numbers in subordinate clauses, and here especially in conditional clauses. The preponderance of such forms in

conditional clauses can perhaps be explained if we consider that speakers encountered such obsolescent forms mainly in legal texts, which are of course particularly rich in conditional clauses. All types of extra-paradigmatic subjunctives predominate in main clauses. The reason seems to be that the use of dying forms is a conscious decision, and speakers tend to make such a decision mainly in contexts where the mood has some meaning: in subordinate clauses the subjunctive is often little more than a marker of subordination. By contrast, the restriction of most sigmatic futures to subordinate clauses has to do with their meaning of relative time, which is more suitable for subordinate clauses. The sigmatic infinitives are very rare as early as Plautus and are restricted to a few verbs of the first conjugation.

Most extra-paradigmatic forms belong to a higher register, which is not surprising for obsolescent forms. But *faxō* in main clauses, *ausim*, and *attigās* in prohibitions are comparatively frequent and stylistically neutral.

I gave particular emphasis to the tense and aspect of the extra-paradigmatic forms as well as to their distribution over the different clause types. *Faxō* in main clauses has sometimes lost its verbal status. Where it is still verbal, it functions like a perfective simple future. The sigmatic futures in subordinate clauses, on the other hand, express anteriority and conclusion, that is, they are much closer to future perfects. The sigmatic infinitives always have future reference in ACIs, but this does not entail that they function like future infinitives. In Archaic Latin the present infinitive can also have future reference in ACIs, and I argued that the data are too scarce to be certain whether the sigmatic infinitives are closer to future or present infinitives. What is highly surprising is that all three types of extra-paradigmatic subjunctives have the same tense and aspect and also the same distribution patterns. They never have past meaning, just like the present subjunctives, but also like the perfect subjunctives in prohibitions and potential statements. Their distribution over the various clause types is odd: they are virtually absent in commands and *ut*-clauses, but frequent in prohibitions and subordinate *nē*-clauses. They share this distribution with the perfect subjunctive where it has preserved its original non-past meaning. For this reason, I argued that all three types of extra-paradigmatic subjunctives should be regarded as old *perfectum* forms that have not acquired past meaning.

Some of these findings are difficult to explain purely synchronically. Thus the remainder of the book is intended to give a diachronic dimension to the previous chapters. Ch. 11 deals with reconstruction. I shall not advance any new theories, but merely rectify a defect in most of the earlier studies: they neglect the synchronic semantics of the extra-paradigmatic forms, which will turn out to be crucial for a number of problems. Ch. 12 examines what remains of the extra-paradigmatic forms in the classical language and later on. Here the discussions of frequency and productivity in the preceding chapters will be particularly important.

*This page intentionally left blank*

## Part III

# The Extra-Paradigmatic Verb Forms: A Diachronic Analysis

*This page intentionally left blank*

## Introduction to Part III

*Quod ēst ante pedēs noenu spectant, caelī scrūtantur plagās.* (Enn. scaen. 201.)

People do not look at all at what lies before their feet; they search the regions of heaven.

ALL too often, this statement is true in everyday life; but it also provides a warning to philologists not to reconstruct without examining the synchronic data first. It is with some hesitation that I am now turning to Indo-European and Proto-Italic. Yet I hope that I have given sufficient attention to what lies before my feet, and that I have gained a reasonable footing for a diachronic analysis of the extra-paradigmatic verb forms: the entire Part II of this book was dedicated to an analysis of their meaning and use in Archaic Latin. In Chs. 6–8 I examined the sigmatic futures, subjunctives, and indicatives, and in Chs. 9 and 10 I looked at the extra-paradigmatic *ī*- and *ā*-subjunctives. The synchronic patterns uncovered there will turn out to be of great importance for my diachronic studies here.

There is no reason why diachronic studies should always be concerned with reconstruction; sometimes, looking forwards may be just as rewarding as looking backwards. In Ch. 11 I shall look backwards and examine selected problems of Proto-Italic or Indo-European presented by the extra-paradigmatic forms. The main focus will be those areas where functional analyses such as those provided in Part II can contribute to our understanding of morphological problems. In Ch. 12 I shall look forwards and see what remains of the extra-paradigmatic forms in Classical Latin and later stages of the language. The main question is whether all forms, without any distinctions,

are simply becoming rarer and rarer, or whether there are certain patterns of loss. For this, of course, the patterns of usage dealt with in Part II are essential. If there are such patterns of loss, they might tell us something about how speakers learn and memorize forms and their usage. It would be interesting to compare the obsolescence of forms and constructions in a 'healthy' language with changes foreshadowing language death in a future study.

## Some Problems of Reconstruction

IN Chs. 6–10 I looked at the meaning and usage of the various extra-paradigmatic verb forms in Archaic Latin. To some extent I was also able to point out diachronic changes. However, these were all changes within Archaic Latin itself. In this chapter I want to look beyond Archaic Latin and examine some problems of reconstruction. Nevertheless, this chapter is closely connected with the preceding ones because my diachronic analyses are based as much on semantics as they are on morphology. In fact, it is not my aim to reconstruct any proto-forms myself or to suggest new hypotheses concerning the development of forms from Indo-European to Proto-Italic or from Proto-Italic to Latin. I shall merely outline some of the difficulties and some of the answers that have been suggested, and I shall then, as far as possible, argue for or against the different solutions in the light of my own findings presented in Chs. 6–10.

There are four problems in which I am interested:

1. Does the *-s-* of the sigmatic forms go back to a desiderative or to an aorist morpheme?
2. Why do forms like *faxint* with *-s-* alternate both with rhotacized forms like *monerint* and with geminated forms like *amāssint*?
3. What sigmatic forms are old and what forms are young?
4. How can the *-u-* in *duim* or *duās* and the lack of reduplication in the present subjunctive *dem* be explained?

There are of course further questions. To give an example, is there a connection between Venetic *vha.g.s.to* ‘he made’ and Latin *faxō*? And do the extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctives go back to Proto-Italic preventives? As I have already dealt with some of these issues in de

Melo (2004*a* and forthcoming), I shall not repeat my arguments here; I tried to show that the connection with the Venetic form is untenable and that Proto-Italic had no *ā*-preventives.

Another important question is whether the extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctives are related to the Old Irish *ā*-subjunctives of the type *beraid* (absolute), *·bera* (conjunct), 'he may carry'. Since I do not wish to dedicate a whole section to this issue, I shall say a few words here. For Thurneysen (1946: 380), the connection of *attigās* with the Old Irish forms was obvious. Today, however, the issue has to be raised again, even if scholars like Jasanoff (1994) try to maintain Italo-Celtic \**-ā-*. Oettinger (1984) showed clearly that the Tocharian and Balto-Slavic *ā*-forms are irrelevant here and that we only have to consider Italic and Celtic. In Latin, *-ā-* occurs in the present and aorist. Not so in Old Irish: McCone (1991: 90) argues that 'an Old Irish formation held to contain the irreducible subjunctive marker \**-ā-* cannot be convincingly linked to either the present or the aorist stem of many strong verbs and can only be comfortably analysed as a bare root, typically in the full grade, plus *ā*-suffix.' Schumacher, Schulze-Thulin, and aan de Wiel (2004: 53–4) note the complementary distribution of Irish *-ā-* and *-s-* and reconstruct \**-āse/o-* for the former. This explains why the Middle Welsh equivalents of the Irish *ā*-forms contain *-h-* (< \**-s-*). Since Latin *-ā-* cannot go back to \**-āse/o-*, we have another clear argument against the connection between Old Irish and Latin. But now I shall turn to the four problems mentioned above.

### AORISTS OR DESIDERATIVES?

I have treated sigmatic forms like *faxō*, *faxim*, or *impetrāssere* in Chs. 6–8. It is uncontroversial that such forms cannot be traced back directly to Indo-European (see Porzig 1960: 182). If the formation has its roots there, it has undergone changes beyond those that can be accounted for by the standard phonological developments. Although the various scholars have different views on how exactly the forms should be derived, their opinions can nevertheless be divided into two

groups if we disregard some of the more fanciful speculations:<sup>1</sup> some believe that the *-s-* in *fak-s-ō* is an old aorist morpheme, while others regard it as a desiderative formant.<sup>2</sup> The arguments used by either side normally concentrate on diachronic morphology rather than synchronic semantics. By contrast, my contribution to the debate is mainly semantic and might therefore help to view the problems involved from a different angle.

Sturtevant, looking at the types *faxō/capsō* (3rd-conjugation base verbs) and *indicāssō/negāssim* (1st-conjugation base verbs), claims that 'one can scarcely doubt the connection of both with the Indo-European *s*-aorist' (1911: 221). Similarly, Mellet (1994: 152) thinks that these forms, 'sans doute aucun', go back to sigmatic aorists.<sup>3</sup> However, there are morphological difficulties. The most frequent sigmatic form in Archaic Latin is *faxō*. Yet, as Thomas (1956: 207) points out, its regular perfect *fēcī* goes back to a pre-Latin root aorist (cf. Greek  $\tilde{\epsilon}\text{-}\theta\eta\text{-}\chi\alpha$  and Sanskrit *a-d<sup>h</sup>ā-t*, root *\*d<sup>h</sup>eH<sub>1</sub>(k)-*). Although various languages have alternative aorist forms for the same verb (e.g. Greek  $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\iota\theta\omicron\nu$  and  $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota\sigma\alpha$ ), what we know of Indo-European and Proto-Italic makes it hard to imagine a fully developed sigmatic aorist beside a root aorist. Moreover, the sigmatic aorist has the *e*-grade or the lengthened grade of the root in Indo-European, either of which should give us *†fēxō*, while *faxō* must go back to a zero-grade form *\*d<sup>h</sup>H<sub>1</sub>k-s-oH<sub>1</sub>*.<sup>4</sup> If we should decide to follow the aorist hypothesis, we must explain how it is possible that one and the same

<sup>1</sup> Skutsch (1912: 103) e.g. derives *amāssīt* from *amāns sīt*. But *faciēns sīt* should yield *†faciēssīt* rather than *faxīt*, and the future or future perfect meaning of the indicatives cannot be explained at all.

<sup>2</sup> Other scholars argue that the aorist *-s-* and the desiderative *-s-* could have the same origin, see Thomas (1956: 210–11) and Madvig (1887: 459). Back (1991) gives typological parallels. Such developments can at best belong to pre-Indo-European or perhaps early Indo-European and need not concern us here. In late Indo-European, aorist and desiderative were certainly distinct categories.

<sup>3</sup> See also Pedersen (1921: 12).

<sup>4</sup> Since the pre-form of *faxō* was not created in Indo-European, representing it with a voiced aspirate and laryngeals is somewhat anachronistic. But as the majority of my readers will be more familiar with Indo-European than with Proto-Italic, I have in most instances chosen the Indo-European notation even where it does not represent pronunciation any more.

verb could have two aorist formations, and how some sigmatic aorists could acquire Ø-grade roots.<sup>5</sup>

Desiderative origin is argued for by Benveniste (1922: 34, 38), Jasanoff (1988: 234), and Meiser (1993: 177–8). Rix (1977: 148 n. 5) has similar views; he believes that the Osco-Umbrian future *fu-s-t* and the Latin subjunctive *faxim* < \**d<sup>h</sup>H<sub>1</sub>k-s-i(e)H<sub>1</sub>-m* both go back to athematic, unreduplicated desideratives. Jasanoff (1991: 85 n. 3) links the Latin forms with the *s*-futures of Celtic, Greek, Indo-Iranian, and Balto-Slavic, but not with the Indo-European *s*-aorist. According to Benveniste, the desideratives developed into subjunctives, and the new subjunctives, like the inherited ones, in turn developed into futures.<sup>6</sup> *Faxīs* (with optative *-ī-*) is considered an innovation. Benveniste also claims that the desiderative meaning can sometimes still be seen in Archaic Latin, but his examples are not convincing. He translates *niſi quid conchārum capsimus cēnātī*<sup>7</sup> *sumus profectō* (*Rud.* 304) as ‘Si nous ne voulons pas prendre quelques coquillages, adieu notre dîner!’ (1922: 50). However, it is beyond question that the fishermen want to catch something. What is at stake is not the will, but the ability to get food: the weather is bad. While Jasanoff (1991: 99) agrees with Benveniste to some extent and thinks that *faxim* originally had a desiderative nuance, he does not believe that it can be detected synchronically any more. From a purely morphological perspective, the desiderative hypothesis is just as problematic as the aorist theory. Jasanoff (1988: 232–3) identifies four non-aoristic *s*-formation types in Indo-European languages:

1. *e*-grade root + \**-syē/o-*: Balto-Slavic and Indo-Iranian future, for example Vedic *dāsyāti* ‘he will give’ < \**deH<sub>3</sub>-syē-ti*;

<sup>5</sup> St. John’s theory (1974: 151) would require too extensive a treatment to be discussed here. He claims that the Indo-European active root aorist often had a medio-passive sigmatic aorist in the Ø-grade beside it. He thinks that Latin *faxit* is based on such a middle form.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. the Sanskrit subjunctive *asat/asati* and the Latin future *erit* (still *esed* in the inscription in *CIL* i<sup>2</sup>. 1), both from the Indo-European subjunctive \**H<sub>1</sub>es-e-t*. However, there are no parallels for a change from desiderative to subjunctive, see Bammesberger (1982: 67).

<sup>7</sup> Lindsay (1922: 91) reads *cēnātī* as well, but in his edition we find *īncēnātī*.

2. *e*-grade root + \*-*se/o*-: Greek future, for instance *πεισόμεθα* 'we shall suffer' < \**pend<sup>h</sup>-so-med<sup>h</sup> H<sub>2</sub>*;<sup>8</sup>
3. *e*-grade root + \*-*s*-: Baltic, Osco-Umbrian, and Old Irish future, for example Old Irish *reiss* 'he will run' < \**ret-s-ti*;
4. *i*-reduplication + Ø-grade root + \*-*se/o*-: Old Irish future and Indo-Iranian desiderative, for instance Vedic *cíkitsati* 'desires to perceive' < \**k<sup>w</sup>í-k<sup>w</sup>ít-se-ti*.<sup>9</sup>

None of these types is a good match for Latin *faxō/faxim*, which has a Ø-grade root and began as an athematic formation, as the athematic optative marker *-ī-* shows.<sup>10</sup> (1), (2), and (3) all have *e*-grade roots, and in (1) and (2) the suffix is in addition thematic. Only in (4) do we find the required Ø-grade root, but unlike in *faxō/faxim* we have reduplication and a thematic suffix. Reduplication may have been lost, but it is highly unlikely that a thematic formation became athematic: it is normally the other way round in Latin. If we still want to claim that *faxō* goes back to a desiderative, we either have to posit some changes in the morphology or to reconstruct yet another Indo-European desiderative formation *ad hoc*. Besides, Latin has created special desideratives in *-essō/-issō* like *petessō/incipissō*<sup>11</sup> and in *-urīre* like *adulēsciturīre/ēsurīre*.<sup>12</sup> Just as it would be strange to have a complete paradigm of sigmatic aorists of *facere* next to the root aorist *fēcī*, it would be odd to form new desideratives like *facessō* and *capessō*

<sup>8</sup> The Greek future could also go back to aorist subjunctives, see Bammesberger (1982: 67). In Doric, \*-*seye/o-* was used.

<sup>9</sup> \**k<sup>w</sup>*- before \*-*i-* regularly yields *c*-; but Sanskrit does not allow *c*- as onset in two consecutive syllables, hence *cíkitsati* instead of †*cícitsati*. This follows the pattern of *jagāna* 'I became' (Greek γέγονα), where the sequence *j- g-* is what we expect from the standard phonological developments.

<sup>10</sup> If *faxō* goes back to an athematic desiderative formation, it is either its subjunctive or an indicative that has been thematized mechanically.

<sup>11</sup> For their meaning see Thomas (1935). *LLF* 555 says that the formation is recent, and he derives it by analogy: *impetrāmus* : *impetrāssimus* :: *incipimus* : *incipissimus*. This would presuppose that *impetrāssere* originally had desiderative meaning.

<sup>12</sup> According to Risch (1954), *ēsurīre*, the prototype of this formation, began as the opposite of \**saturīre* 'be full'. *Esurīre* originally meant 'be hungry', but later on it changed to 'want to eat'. The disadvantage of this theory is that the existence of \**saturīre* cannot be motivated on independent grounds, but is merely postulated in order to derive *ēsurīre*. This formation is relatively productive, cf. Cic. *Att.* 9. 10. 6: *sullāturit animus eius et prōscripturit iam diū*, 'his mind has been eager to act like Sulla and to conduct a proscription for a long time.'

alongside *faxō* and *capsō*. If *capessō* 'I want to catch' was formed by analogy to *impetrāssō*, the latter must still have had desiderative meaning; if so, *capsō* is unlikely to have lost its desiderative force when *capessō* was created. In short, if we opt for the desiderative hypothesis, the problems we face are very similar to those of the aorist theory: we have to find reasons why the inherited desiderative formations were modified and why we should have *capessō* next to *capsō*.

Occam's Razor prevents us from reconstructing a third *s*-formation which is neither aoristic nor desiderative and which has no parallels in related languages. We must decide for the aorist or the desiderative hypothesis. Neither of them is straightforward from a morphological point of view. But on the other hand, the morphological difficulties do not seem to be insurmountable either, regardless of which theory we accept. This makes it very difficult to argue for one or the other without looking at the semantics as well. Here the synchronic analyses may be of some use. The infinitives, being late creations and rare in frequency, cannot tell us much and have to be left out of account. The indicatives and the subjunctives, by contrast, are not only older, but also more frequent, so their semantics could perhaps help us to decide for one of the hypotheses.

In Ch. 6 I discussed the sigmatic indicatives. Their patterns of distribution are very clear. If we take Plautus and Terence together, there are fifty-four tokens in subordinate clauses and seventy-nine in main clauses. The tokens in subordinate clauses belong to twenty-nine different verbs and have no person or number restrictions, while the only form to appear in main clauses is the isolated and fossilized *faxō*. The forms in subordinate clauses alternate with the regular future perfects; like them, they express anteriority and conclusion. The isolated *faxō*, on the other hand, is closer to the simple future: it does not indicate that the act of doing something is anterior to or concluded before something else, but simply that it is going to be in the future. *Faxō* in main clauses can always be interpreted as perfective. Synchronically, this may have to do not with the *s*-morpheme, but with the fact that it is used in promises and threats. This kind of speech act is normally perfective. Given the discrepancy in semantics between the forms in main and subordinate clauses, we must ask ourselves which meaning is older. The forms in subordinate clauses with future perfect meaning have a certain degree of productivity or

are at least not completely fossilized and unchangeable, as is shown by *ni eī caput exoculāssitis* ‘if you shall not have deprived his head of his eyes’ (*Rud.* 731). Here *exoculāre* bears all the hallmarks of a nonce-formation. It is formed like *dēsquāmāre* ‘to remove the scales’, *exossāre* ‘to remove the bones’, and *exdorsuāre* ‘to remove the backbone’; all three are kitchen terms. A nonce-formation similar to *exoculāre* is *dēnāsāre* (*Capt.* 604) ‘to remove somebody’s nose’. *Exoculāre* itself is only attested here and twice in Apuleius, who often imitates Plautus (*Apul. met.* 7. 2, 8. 13).<sup>13</sup> As fossilized forms are more likely to have preserved the original semantics, it seems that the meaning of anteriority in *exoculāssitis* etc. is secondary.

The simple future meaning of main clause *faxō* can be derived without problems, whether we assume that *faxō* goes back to a desiderative or to an aorist subjunctive. But how did the meaning of anteriority and conclusion arise in subordinate clauses? If we believe that the sigmatic futures come from desideratives, we should expect that they originally had simple future meaning without any particular aspectual nuances. The anteriority and conclusion of our forms in subordinate clauses would then be the result of reanalysis: since many subordinate clauses express events that are over before the main clause actions, the sigmatic forms would have come to have this meaning obligatorily. However, this is not what happened to regular simple futures like *laudābō* in subordinate clauses; they are admittedly found in some subordinate clauses whose events are over before the main clause actions—this happens when the writers choose not to make the anteriority and conclusion explicit by using the future perfect; but there are also enough contexts in which it is impossible to interpret subordinate clauses with simple futures as anterior, and it is these clauses that prevent the reanalysis of simple futures like *laudābō* as future perfects. Thus if the sigmatic forms go back to desideratives, the meaning of anteriority and conclusion in

<sup>13</sup> Speakers can attach the *s(s)*-morpheme to new verbs, but it does not follow that the formation is part of the living language. Even though e.g. the sigmatic infinitives are not used in everyday discourse, we find sigmatic infinitives which are nonce-formations, cf. *deargentāssere* (*Lucil.* 682). Similarly, most speakers of English can employ the verb endings *-est* and *-eth* when imitating archaic English, but would not do so in normal conversation. (In some dialects, forms like *thou* have of course survived.)

subordinate clauses is hard to derive. If, on the other hand, they go back to aorist subjunctives, we expect that their original meaning is that of perfective futures. This would have been preserved in main clauses, where *faxō* became fossilized and consequently escaped semantic changes affecting its temporal and aspectual meaning. But from a typological perspective, the reanalysis of perfective forms as anterior and concluded is not unusual,<sup>14</sup> and so the perfective future *capsō* became a future anterior in subordinate clauses. Consequently the synchronic semantics of the sigmatic indicatives can easily be derived if we decide for the aorist hypothesis, but not if we follow the desiderative theory.

I shall now examine whether the sigmatic subjunctives confirm or contradict either of the theories. In Ch. 7 I argued that they always have the time reference of regular present subjunctives. Again, this is not surprising regardless of whether they are derived from desideratives or from aorist optatives. However, in the usage of sigmatic subjunctives there are two anomalies which concern directives. Here the sigmatic subjunctives are subject to the same restrictions as the perfect forms, which normally have past meaning, except for their use in directives, where they have present or future force like present tense subjunctives. The first restriction is that sigmatic and perfect subjunctives can be found in prohibitions, but not in commands. The figures are too high to be due to chance: there are 31 relevant sigmatic forms and 44 relevant perfect forms in Plautus and Terence. The present subjunctives, on the other hand, are used in both commands and prohibitions. The second restriction is that the prohibitions in the sigmatic and perfect subjunctives are almost exclusively in the second person: all the 31 prohibitions containing sigmatic subjunctives in Plautus and Terence are in the second person, while the third person occurs only once, in Enn. fr. uar. 17–18, and 42 of the 44 prohibitions in the perfect subjunctive are in the second person in Plautus and Terence. By contrast, prohibitive present subjunctives are more frequent in the third person than in the second. The fact that the same two restrictions apply to perfect and sigmatic subjunctives, but not to present tense forms, must be significant. It may point to

<sup>14</sup> The reason is that in a language that distinguishes between perfective and imperfective, but is deficient in expressions of anteriority, it is the perfective that must make good the gap.

a common origin for the sigmatic and perfect subjunctives. Now the Latin perfect is an amalgam of Indo-European aorist and perfect formations, and the non-past, prohibitive perfect subjunctive continues old aorist usages. The shared restrictions of prohibitive perfect and sigmatic subjunctives can be explained by deriving the latter from aorists as well, but not by the desiderative hypothesis.

If this is correct, the question arises why the perfect subjunctives normally have past meaning, while the sigmatic forms never do. From a purely synchronic point of view, in fact, the non-past use of perfect subjunctives in prohibitions and potential statements like *praefiscini hoc nunc dixerim* 'touch wood, I should now say this' (Asin. 491) can only be called an anomaly. Everywhere else, the perfect subjunctive expresses anteriority or past time. However, it is likely that at some prehistoric stage the difference between present and perfect subjunctives was aspectual rather than temporal. In the indicative, on the other hand, the contrast between present and perfect was temporal.<sup>15</sup> According to Wackernagel (1926: 250), the perfect subjunctive then acquired its past meaning by association with the corresponding indicative. It is only in prohibitions and potential statements that the non-past meaning of the perfect subjunctive has remained. By contrast, the sigmatic subjunctives do not normally have sigmatic perfect indicatives with past meaning beside them. Only sporadically do we find a perfect indicative like *parsistī* next to a sigmatic subjunctive such as *parsīs*. Thus the sigmatic subjunctives could not acquire past meaning and kept their present or future force.

This absence of past indicatives is, however, also a serious problem for the aorist hypothesis. It is one of the reasons why Meiser (2003: 38–41) posits a Proto-Italic category 'perfective future', the subjunctive of which is *faxim*, and which is independent of the sigmatic aorist, although it contains an *s*-morpheme. Even if this theory should provide an adequate description of the Proto-Italic facts, it does not explain where the *-s-* comes from originally. Thus it seems best to assume with Narten (1973: 143) that the *s*-formation, while originally

<sup>15</sup> The *perfectum* stem consists of old aorist and perfect formations. Aorist indicatives have always had past meaning, and the perfect was reanalysed as a past tense in late Proto-Italic, see Meiser (2003: 83). This semantic merger of the two tenses into one new tense led to the elimination of one of the two past stems which most verbs had. Only sporadically do such semantic doublets remain, cf. *pepercī* (perfect) versus *parsī* (aorist).

going back to aorists, had acquired a certain degree of independence and productivity in the future (< subjunctive) and subjunctive (< optative); whether it should for this reason be called 'perfective future' is a different question. What is important here is not terminology, but something else: if the *s*-forms are derived from aorists, but have become an independent formation (witness the absence of indicatives like †*faxī*), then having them next to inherited root aorists like *fēcī*, *fēcērō*, *fēcērim* (< \**d<sup>h</sup>eH<sub>1</sub>k-*) is not as problematic as if they were still part of a proper and complete paradigm of sigmatic aorists.

Given that the semantics of both the sigmatic futures and the sigmatic subjunctives points to an aoristic origin of the forms, the anomalous ablaut pattern has to be explained because sigmatic aorists had *e*-grade or lengthened-grade roots in Indo-European, not  $\emptyset$ -grade roots as in *faxō*. Venetic might provide a parallel for *faxō* here, but since it is unclear whether it is part of the Italic family or an independent branch of Indo-European, this parallel has to remain purely typological.<sup>16</sup> The Venetic past *vha.g.s.to* = /*faxsto*/ (roughly equivalent to *fēcīt*, 'he made') clearly shows that the Indo-European ablaut patterns of the *s*-aorist need not be continued in the individual languages. Thus the zero-grade root in *faxō/faxim* does not necessarily militate against interpreting it as aoristic in origin, although it remains unclear where it comes from. However, a simple hypothesis is possible. We could take a verb like \**deyǵ-* 'show, say' as our starting-point. In pre-Latin, it forms a full-grade, thematic present \**deyǵ-e/o-*, and its perfect goes back to a sigmatic aorist \**dēyǵ-s-* (lengthened grade)/\**deyǵ-s-* (full grade). \**dēyǵ-s-* becomes \**deyǵ-s-* by Osthoff's law, so the original distinction between lengthened grade (only aorist) and full grade (present and aorist) disappears. If old modal forms like \**deyǵ-s-iH<sub>1</sub>-mos* become independent, they may be reanalysed as special *s*-forms belonging to the decharacterized present stem \**deyǵ-* rather than to the aorist stem. When the formation spreads to *faciō*, the present stem is used. \**d<sup>h</sup>H<sub>1</sub>k-ye/o-* is decharacterized and gets the *s*-suffix, which gives us \**d<sup>h</sup>H<sub>1</sub>k-s-* > *fak-s-*.

<sup>16</sup> For different views on the genetic affiliation of Venetic see Beeler (1956), de Melo (forthcoming), Euler (1993), Hamp (1954), Lejeune (1974: 163–73), Penney (1988: 726), and Untermann (1980: 315).

THE ORIGIN OF THE -SS- IN *AMĀSSINT*

I still have to explain the alternation between -s-, -r-, and -ss- in *faxint*, *monĕrint*, and *amāssint* because I argued that all three of them go back to sigmatic aorists. Since in Indo-European the aorist marker is \*-s- rather than †-ss-, *faxint* and *monĕrint* are unproblematic. In *faxint* the original \*-s- was preserved because it followed a consonant, while in *monĕrint* it was rhotacized because it was in intervocalic position. The difficulty is *amāssint* with its 'secondarily geminated -ss-' (Jasanoff 1991: 85).

Stempel's way out of this difficulty is to say that -ss- was not a geminate in pronunciation, but merely in orthography (1997: 277 n. 11). He is speaking about an idealized orthography of pre-Classical Latin. Real Latin orthography is not always clear. In inscriptions, geminates were written from the end of the third century BC onwards, but not consistently until around 100 BC (Meiser 1998: 49). Only two of the few inscriptions with relevant sigmatic forms, that is, those with the sigmatic formant after vowels, contain double consonants in spelling. They are the *Lex agr.* (*CIL* i<sup>2</sup>. 585) 71 and *CIL* vi. 10298. Here we find *mercāssitur*, *iūrāssit*, and *iūdicāssit* (twice). The situation is hardly better in the manuscripts: in *aussim*, the -ss- comes from \*-d-s- and was certainly pronounced as a geminate in Plautus' time. But the manuscripts spell *aussim* as either *aussim* or *ausim*. The spelling with -s- can reflect a pronunciation *ausim* in Classical or Late Latin, where Archaic Latin [-ss-] after long vowel or diphthong had changed to [-s-]. Because of this change in pronunciation and later on also in orthography, a manuscript reading *amaso* is irrelevant and does not tell us whether people would have written -ss- earlier on. But the manuscript spelling -ss- after long vowels points to a spelling -ss- in Archaic Latin and is significant. From our two inscriptions and from the manuscript readings we can conclude that the types *amāssō* (1st-conjugation base verb) and *prohibēssīs* (2nd-conjugation base verb) would always have been written with -ss- if they had been used in inscriptions which mark double consonants.

As I said, Stempel claims that -ss- was a geminate only in orthography. In that case, it must of course be asked why there has been no rhotacism (-s- > \*-z- > -r-). His answer is that in forms like *capsō*, the -s- after consonant cannot become voiced, and that this is why

\**amāsō* also keeps a voiceless *-s-*. This voiceless *-s-* is spelt as a double consonant after long vowels.

There are problems with Stempel's approach. One might wonder why the original *-s-* in *monerint* was not kept voiceless and underwent rhotacism, while the *-s-* in \**amāsō* remained unvoiced. However, since the reason for keeping *-s-* voiceless is morphological rather than phonological, one cannot expect that there are no exceptions. It would only be natural that some forms should not keep the voiceless sound. Other difficulties are more worrying. The spelling *-ss-* after long vowel or diphthong is normally etymological, as in *cāssus* < \**kad-tos* (with vowel lengthening by Lachmann's law). These spellings were still current in Cicero's and Virgil's days<sup>17</sup> and to some extent even later,<sup>18</sup> although it is often claimed that in pronunciation *-ss-* had been simplified earlier (somewhat arbitrarily, the date for this is set around 100 BC by Meiser 1998: 125). After short vowels, *-ss-* remained in both spelling and pronunciation. Rhotacism of simple *-s-* can be dated to the fourth century BC, when geminates did exist in pronunciation, but not yet in spelling. If we take Stempel's line, there are two possible scenarios, neither of which is particularly likely. In the first, we have to assume that, when geminate *-ss-* was introduced in spelling, it still existed in pronunciation not only after short vowels, but also after long ones. This means that we should have the pronunciation *cāssus* alongside \**amāsō*, but would write either with *-ss-* to indicate voicelessness. However, voiced \**-z-* had become *-r-* by that time. Consequently there was no voiced \**-z-* and thus no need to mark what was pronounced [-*s-*] as voiceless in spelling. Moreover, in that case the contrast between non-geminated, voiceless [-*s-*] in \**amāsō* and geminated, equally voiceless [-*ss-*] in *cāssus* would not be visible any more. After short vowels, the few instances of preserved simple [-*s-*] (*rōsa* etc.) were usually not written *-ss-* either; this spelling was reserved for [-*ss-*].<sup>19</sup> The second scenario is even more

<sup>17</sup> This is stated explicitly in Quint. *inst.* 1. 7. 20. For inscriptions with the spelling *-ss-* after long vowel see *LLF* 181.

<sup>18</sup> *-ss-* after long vowel is still common in the writing tablets from Vindolanda (1st/2nd c. AD), see Adams (1995b: 89). *Prō ssummā* might belong here as well because the preposition is proclitic (Adams 2003b: 539).

<sup>19</sup> Adams (1990: 238–40) discusses how C. Novius Eunus (early 1st c. AD) writes geminates. Most geminates are written as simple consonants, but *s* is the exception: it is constantly written as a geminate. After long vowels this normally reflects the

unlikely. We should assume that [-ss-] was still pronounced after short vowels, but not any more after long vowels when the spelling -ss- was introduced. After short vowels, the pronunciations [-s-] and [-ss-] would be reflected accurately by the orthography, whereas after long vowels there would only be simplified [-s-] in pronunciation, written [-ss-] to indicate that it was voiceless. Since the spelling -s- after short vowel presumably also stands for a voiceless sound,<sup>20</sup> it is unclear why the [-s-] after long vowel should be written as a geminate.

As neither of these scenarios is convincing, it must be assumed that *amāssō* had a geminate -ss- in pronunciation in Archaic Latin. But how did it arise?

I shall discuss two suggestions that are purely phonological. One is by Sturtevant (1911: 221), the other by Benveniste (1922: 53–4). Sturtevant's theory bears some similarities to Stempel's approach: because -s- is voiceless in forms like *capsō* he argues that there was an attempt at keeping -s- voiceless in *\*prohibēsīt*. This resulted in a hypercorrect form; when speakers tried to say *\*prohibēsīt* instead of *\*prohibēzīt*, they actually pronounced *prohibēssīt*. Again, it is not surprising that some forms like *monerint* escaped the hypercorrection. However, since there are no convincing parallels for this particular hypercorrect pronunciation in Latin,<sup>21</sup> the theory cannot be upheld.<sup>22</sup> Its outcome, by the way, would be ironic: speakers tried to maintain one single sound, the simple, voiceless -s-, but ended up with three allomorphs, -s-, -r-, and -ss-.

traditional spelling and is etymologically justifiable. After short vowels it is unetymological e.g. in *possitum*; Adams suggests that there is a tendency to geminate the s because simple s after short vowel is rare. (I suspect that this gemination is purely orthographical.)

<sup>20</sup> -s- after short vowel occurs e.g. in loanwords like *cisium* 'two-wheeled carriage' (Gaulish).

<sup>21</sup> Hypercorrection in Latin mostly involves vowels and h. For *ō* > hypercorrect *au* cf. *plōdere* and hypercorrect *plaudere*: if *au* were old we should expect the compound to be †*explōdere* rather than *explōdere*, cf. *claudere* and *exclūdere*; see also the anecdote in Suet. *Vesp.* 22. For *ae* instead of *ē* see LLF 68. For h- and aspirated stops see Catull. 84. For Faliscan *foied* (= *hodiē*) with f- instead of h- see Wallace and Joseph (1991).

<sup>22</sup> Thomas (1956: 205) has a similar solution: 'la géminée paraît répondre au désir de maintenir entre voyelles l'-s- sourde de *faxōl/faxim*, comme dans la graphie *caussa* de *causa*.' But does he really think that the geminated -ss- in *caussa* was merely graphic and stood for simple, voiceless [-s-] when the spelling *amāssō* was introduced?

Benveniste claims that the *-s-* in a form like *capsō* is its most important, or at least its most characteristic, morpheme, and that this led to 'gémiation expressive'. While it can be imagined that the *[-ss-]* in the superlative suffix *-issimus* is the result of expressive gemination,<sup>23</sup> where the double consonant is iconic, it seems unlikely to me that a marker of tense, aspect, or *Aktionsart* can have enough affective content to cause gemination.

Rix's approach (1998a: 625–6) is partly phonological and partly morphological. The phonological rule he invokes to derive *-ss-* is the so-called *littera*-rule,  $\check{V}C > \check{V}CC$ . The word *littera* itself comes from earlier *lītera*, which in turn goes back to *leitera* with a diphthong. Another example is *Iūppiter* < *Iūpiter* (< *Ioupiter*). The rule can only apply if there is a long monophthong before a single consonant. Monophthongization of *-ey-* and *-ow-* took place in the third century BC (see Meiser 1998: 58–60). However, if rhotacism can be dated to the fourth century BC, we should expect  $*amāsō > †amārō > †amārrō$ . Rix deals with this difficulty by arguing that the *littera*-rule applied over a long period of time or several times in succession. He claims that it already existed in Proto-Italic; this is how he explains Oscan *tt*-perfects like *prúfattens* (Cm 2. 4) '*probāuērunt*'. The Oscan forms are supposed to come from reanalysed perfect passive participles, where the nominative and accusative neuter singular ( $*provātom$ ) have the same ending as the first person singular of the perfect. According to Rix (1992: 238–9), the derivation process might look like this:  $*termnātom$  *fefakom* 'I made demarcated' becomes  $*termnātom$  by ellipsis, '(sc. I made) demarcated'. This was reanalysed as a perfect active indicative,  $*termnātom$  'I demarcated'. Via the *littera*-rule we get *termnattom*. This may or may not be the correct origin of the Oscan *tt*-perfect; there is no way of proving, and to me the idea seems far-fetched. *Amāssō*, then, is derived as follows:  $*amāsō$  becomes  $*amāssō$ , which turns into  $*amēssō$  by the regular vowel weakening, but *-ā-* or perhaps *-ǣ-* is restored by analogy to forms like *amās*. Rix acknowledges that the *littera*-rule is not an exceptionless sound law. In our case it applies to each and every sigmatic form with *-s-* after long vowel for morphological reasons:

<sup>23</sup> Meiser (1998: 153) believes that the *-ss-* in *pessimus* (*-ss-* <  $*-d-s-$ ) could have been of influence.

in Proto-Italic, speakers want to differentiate between the perfective future *\*amāses* (> *amāssis*) and a category which Rix regards as an imperfective *s*-future and which looks the same (*\*amāses*), but is not continued in Latin. Meiser (1993) derives the Osco-Umbrian *s*-future from this second category, for instance Oscan *deiuast* 'iūrābit' in the Tabula Bantina (Lu 1/TB 3) < *\*deywā-se-ti*. The subjunctive of this future has the formant *\*-se-e-* > *\*-sē-* and ends up as the imperfect subjunctive in both Osco-Umbrian and Latin, which did not preserve the future; compare the following corresponding imperfect subjunctives: Oscan *fusíd* (í = /ē/; Cippus Abellanus, Cm 1/CA A 19) = Latin *forēt*, and Oscan *patensíns* (Cm 1/CA B 24) = Latin *panderent*.

Although I cannot agree with Rix, it has to be admitted that his theory has one great advantage: he can treat *moneris* and *sīrint* as containing the same formant as the sigmatic forms without positing exceptions to his rule. The future *monērís* goes back to an old subjunctive *\*monē-s-e-s* with *-ē-* before *\*-s-*, and the subjunctive *sīrint* comes from the old optative *\*sey-s-iH<sub>1</sub>-(e)nt* with a diphthong before it. In either case the *littera*-rule cannot preserve the *\*-s-*: *\*monē-s-e-s* has a short vowel instead of a long one, and *\*sey-s-iH<sub>1</sub>-(e)nt* undergoes rhotacism before there is monophthongization of *-ey-*.

However, there are also difficulties with Rix's approach. First of all, apart from the *s*-forms there is no convincing reason for dating the *littera*-rule back to Proto-Italic. The Oscan *tt*-perfect may or may not be the outcome of such a rule; its origins are very unclear. Even if *-tt-* goes back to earlier *\*-t-*, the rule could have applied independently in Oscan.<sup>24</sup> Thus the argument becomes circular; we derive Latin *-ss-* from *\*-s-* by applying a rule in Proto-Italic, but the only evidence that this rule existed as early as Proto-Italic is *-ss-*. The circularity gets even worse if we consider which consonants can be geminated by this rule: the list in *LLF* 183–4 contains voiceless stops (*Iūpiter* versus *Iūppiter*), *-r-* (*gnārus* versus *nārrō*), and *-l-* (*fēlāre* versus *fēllāre*);<sup>25</sup> *-s-* is not mentioned, and the only examples of the rule applying to *-s-* would

<sup>24</sup> The *tt*-perfect is not only absent in Latin, but also, as far as we can tell, in Umbrian. This makes it likely that it is an Oscan innovation.

<sup>25</sup> It seems more likely that the form with the geminate goes back to the *littera*-rule, which would entail a short vowel before the double consonant, than that the geminate is the result of expressive gemination, which would leave the vowel quantity unaffected.

again be the sigmatic forms. Even if one accepted that the *littera*-rule existed in Proto-Italic and could affect \*-s-, it would be impossible to endorse Rix's theory. Since the rule usually operates only sporadically, it is unclear why all the members of a tense or aspect category should be subject to it. Sound laws are not normally restricted to particular tenses.

This leaves us with purely morphological explanations. The suggestion in *LLF* 624 is very appealing. He starts from short pluperfect forms like *dixem* and *amāssem* for *dixissem* and *amāuissem*. It does not matter here whether we assume that forms like *dixtī* and *amārō* go back to Proto-Italic sigmatic aorists, *\*deyk-s-stay*<sup>26</sup> and *\*amā-s-ō*, or whether we think that they arose within the history of Latin, *dixtī* by haplology and *amārō* by analogy to *dēcrērō* < *dēcrēuerō* with loss of /-w-/ between vowels of the same quality. The pluperfect indicatives and subjunctives did not exist in Proto-Italic and were created later on (Meiser 2003: 142); whichever theory we believe in, *dixem* and *amāssem* must be secondary, analogical formations. *LLF* establishes a four-part analogy of the type *dixem*: *dīxō/dīxim*:: *amāssem*: *amāssō/amāssim*. This gives us the geminate and the long vowel before it. Obviously, this does not work for verbs of the second conjugation like *prohibēre*; *prohibēssīs* cannot be derived in this way because the pluperfect subjunctive is *prohibuissēs*, not †*prohibēssēs*. Probably we have to assume another four-part analogy: *amāre*: *amāssīs*:: *prohibēre*: *prohibēssīs*. *Prohibēssīs* would be a very late formation because it depends on *amāssīs*, which in turn arose after *amāssēs*, and *amāssēs* was formed within Latin, not during the Proto-Italic period. This, however, would be in accord with the extremely low frequency of the type *prohibēssīs* in Archaic Latin.<sup>27</sup>

Since most of the sigmatic forms did not survive in the spoken language, we cannot tell how they were pronounced when they were used as deliberate archaisms. When Cicero wrote *creāssit* in imitation of old laws, did he intend a pronunciation with a geminate [-ss-]? This would have been a spelling pronunciation in his time because [-ss-]

<sup>26</sup> In *\*deyk-s-stay* the aorist ending \*-s- was either redetermined by the perfect ending \*-tay or there is a perfect ending \*-stay.

<sup>27</sup> In *aussim* and *occīssit* (normally written *occīsīt* in the manuscripts), -ss- comes from *\*-d-s-*. This -ss- was probably also of influence in the creation of forms like *amāssō*.

had already been simplified in pronunciation after long vowels and diphthongs.<sup>28</sup> It is possible that he wrote *creāssit* and pronounced it as [creāsīt], just as he wrote *caussa* and said [causa]. The pronunciation [creāsīt] is actually quite likely because *aussim* is one of the few sigmatic forms to survive, and it was undoubtedly pronounced [ausim] (with single [-s-]) when Cicero wrote. It is perhaps also possible that Cicero pronounced the form *creāssit* as [creāsīt] because the written sequence <ass> more often stands for [-äss-] (*ässerēs* etc.) than for [-ās-] (*cāssus* etc.).

## ANCIENT AND RECENT SIGMATIC FORMS

Sigmatic futures and subjunctives like *dīxō* and *dīxim* originally go back to subjunctives and optatives of sigmatic aorists, but then the formation became independent. Forms like *faxō* never had sigmatic past indicatives beside them. Above I suggested that *\*deyk-s-ō/\*deyk-s-īm* were reanalysed: they go back to aorist subjunctives and optatives, but came to be regarded as being formed from the decharacterized present stem *\*deyk-*. The characterized present stem is thematic *\*deyk-e/o-*. After this process of reanalysis, *\*fak-s-ō/\*fak-s-īm* could be formed from the *ye/o-*-present *\*fak-ye/o-*, and presumably it was then no longer possible to create new sigmatic futures and subjunctives from *s*-perfects. Thus if Plautus wanted to form a sigmatic future from *regō*, he could not use the *s*-perfect, but would have to take the present stem. While derivation from the decharacterized present stem works well for thematic presents and *ye/o-*-presents, problems arise when we want to get *rupsit* from a nasal-infix present *rumpō*. It is highly likely that the *-m-* in *rumpō* could synchronically no longer be analysed as a present formant, and we should expect †*rumpsit*. We can get *rupsit* by a purely formal analogy involving the past participle:

<sup>28</sup> *-äss-* existed only in the type *amāssit* = *amāūisset*, where *-ss-* was preserved or restituted for morphological reasons, see *LLF* 181. Still, these pluperfects with long *-ā-*, together with the fact that the sigmatic forms could be regarded as *perfectum* forms, might have facilitated the pronunciation *-äss-*.

*fac-tum : fac-sit :: rup-tum : rup-sit.*<sup>29</sup> In this section, I shall try to find out what sigmatic futures and subjunctives are old and go back to Proto-Italic *s*-aorists, and what forms are young and were created from the present or the perfect passive stem after the process of reanalysis. When I am speaking of recent forms, I cannot give absolute dates; the young forms arose within Latin rather than Proto-Italic, but it is impossible to be more precise.

I shall ignore the types *amāssō*, *prohibēssīs*, and *ambīssint* because they are late formations from their respective present or perfect passive stems.<sup>30</sup> The remaining forms can be put into four different groups, depending on how the Latin perfect is formed:

1. the Latin perfect continues a sigmatic aorist;
2. the Latin perfect continues a non-sigmatic aorist;
3. the Latin perfect is formed with *-u/w-*;
4. the Latin perfect continues a reduplicating perfect.

Group 1 comprises fifteen verbs: *affligere*, *āmittere*, *aspicere*, *audēre*, *augēre*, *clēpere*, *dīcere*, *excēdere*, *excūtere*, *extinguere*, *indūcere*, *īnsēcere*, *iubēre*, *pārcere*,<sup>31</sup> and *sērpere*. Their sigmatic futures or subjunctives look as follows: *afflīxint*, *āmissīs*, *aspēxit*, *ausim*, *auxītis*, *clēpsit*, *dixīs*, *excessīs*, *excūssīs*, *extīnxīt*, *induxīs*, *īnsēxit*, *iussō*, *pārsīs*, and *sērpsit*. All these sigmatic futures and subjunctives could be based on the Proto-Italic *s*-aorists, which are continued as Latin *s*-perfects, and in the absence of contrary evidence, this is perhaps the simplest hypothesis. However, it is possible that some of the forms were created late, after the *s*-formation had become independent. The *s*-futures or *s*-subjunctives might then be based on the present or the perfect passive stem.

<sup>29</sup> The Latin 'third stem', from which we get the perfect passive participle *factum* and the supine *factū*, is also used in the formation of the future participle *factūrus* and the frequentative *facitāre* etc. Since the 'third stem' is employed for derivations with such different meanings, Aronoff (1994: 57) thinks that it has no tense or aspect meaning itself. My analogy is purely formal and does not entail that the sigmatic forms were regarded as derivations of that 'third stem'.

<sup>30</sup> *Exoculāssitis* is perhaps the best example of a late formation; it seems to have been invented by Plautus.

<sup>31</sup> *Parcere* also has a reduplicating perfect *pepercī*, but we can ignore this form here. What matters is the presence of an *s*-perfect.

Two forms, *aussim* and *iüssō*, need some more discussion. *Audēre* is normally a semi-deponent since its perfect *ausus sum* is medio-passive. Thus at first sight the form *aussim* seems to be derived not from an old sigmatic aorist active (like *dīxim* from *dīxī*), but from the present stem or the past participle, which would entail that the form was recent. However, this is not certain because in Archaic Latin we also find the active sigmatic perfect *ausī*.<sup>32</sup> *Iüssō* presumably has -*ŭ*- like the present *iūbeō* and the perfect *iüssī*. However, the older forms are *ioubeō*<sup>33</sup> and *iousī*, and the forms with short vowel appear to be remodelled on the basis of the participle *iūssum*. If *iüssō* is old and based on the *s*-aorist/*s*-perfect, it must have been remade from earlier *ioussit*. It cannot be based on the present *iūbeō*; by the time the present had -*ŭ*- it had long since changed \*-*d<sup>h</sup>*- to -*b*-, and we should get †*iūpsō*. If *iüssō* is young, it must be formed from the past participle *iūssum*.

There is also the related problem of whether for example the -*u*- in *induxīs* is long or short. If the form is based on the *s*-aorist (> *s*-perfect) *indūxī* or the present *indūcō* the -*u*- is long, but if it is based on the perfect participle *indūctum* it is short. This question is irrelevant for *ausim* and *auxītis* because -*au*-, being a diphthong, is always long. If the present, perfect, and perfect participle stems agree in the vowel quantities of their root syllables, the sigmatic futures/subjunctives will not be different because they have to be derived from one of these categories. Thus the following vowel quantities in root syllables are uncontroversial: *afflixint*, *aspēxit*, *clēpsit*, *excūssīs*, *īnsēxit*, *iüssō*, *pārsīs*, and *sērpsit*. The irregular subjunctive *extīnxīt* (present *extīnguō*, perfect *extīnxī*) has -*ī*- because vowels before -*nks*- ([*-nχs-*]) are lengthened.<sup>34</sup> *Dixīs* probably has -*ī*- because it seems to go back to an *s*-aorist subjunctive. If, however, it is young and is based on the perfect passive participle *dīctum*, we should have *dīxīs*. We are now left with two verbs, *āmittere* and *excēdere*. They have different vowel quantities in their presents and *s*-perfects (*āmīttō* versus *āmīsī* and *excēdō* versus *excēssī*). Because there is no agreement between present and perfect, and because we cannot know on which

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Cato *orat.* 166: *nōn ausī recūsāre*.

<sup>33</sup> This is an old causative, cf. Sanskrit *yōd<sup>h</sup>āyati* < \**yowd<sup>h</sup>-éye-ti*.

<sup>34</sup> For this sound change see Meiser (1998: 78–9).

of the stems the extra-paradigmatic forms are based, the vowel quantities of the root syllables of *āmissīs* and *excessīs* must remain unclear.

Group 2 comprises three verbs: *fācere* with *fāxō*, *obiċere* with *obiċxīs*, and *rūmpere* with *rūpsit*. All three of them have Latin perfects that continue root aorists;<sup>35</sup> consequently *fāxō*, *obiċxīs* and *rūpsit* are unlikely to go back to complete paradigms of sigmatic aorists and must have been formed after the *s*-formation had become independent.

All three verbs have short vowels in the present and perfect participle stems; the sigmatic forms must be derived from either of these stems, and so they must have short root vowels. For *fāxō* the existence of short *-ā-* is proved by the fact that the compounds (*effċxis* etc.) underwent vowel weakening or were formed late from the past participle, which had undergone the weakening. Much the same can be said about *iāċere* and *obiċxim*.

Group 3 contains not only *noxīt* from *nocēre* and *rapsit* from *rapere*, but also the rhotacized forms *adiūuerō*, *monċrint*, and *sīrint*. The perfects are formed with [-*u-*] or [-*w-*]: *nocuī*, *rapuī*, *adiūuī*, *monuī*, and *sīuī*. The *u/w*-perfect is a Latin innovation without parallels in Osco-Umbrian. As it is in complementary distribution with the inherited *s*-perfect, Meiser (2003: 224–6) argues that wherever we find the *u/w*-perfect, it has replaced an older *s*-aorist.<sup>36</sup> If this is true, our five forms could be remains of such aorists: *\*noke-s-ī-t* > *noxīt* (*\*noke-w-ay* > *nocuī*), *\*rape-s-e-t* > *rapsit* (*\*rape-w-ay* > *rapuī*), *\*yuwā-s-ō* > *iūuerō* (*\*yuwa-w-ay* > *iūuī*), *\*monċ-s-e-s* > *monċris* (*\*monċ-w-ay* > *monuī*), and *\*sey-s-iH<sub>1</sub>-(e)nt* > *sīrint* (*\*sey-w-ay* > *sīuī*). In theory, *noxīt*, *rapsit*, and *monċris* could also be young derivations from their respective present or past participle stems (present: *\*noke-ye/o-*,<sup>37</sup> *\*rap-e/o-*, *mone-ye/o-*; past participles: *\*noke-to-*, *\*rap-to-*, *mone-to-*). However, it is simpler to get them from old *s*-aorists. For *iūuerō* and *sīrint*, alternative derivations from the

<sup>35</sup> For *fēcī* cf. Greek *ἐθῆκα* and Sanskrit *ad<sup>h</sup>āt* (root *\*d<sup>h</sup>eH<sub>1</sub>-k-*); for *iēcī* cf. Greek *ῥῆκα* (root *\*HyeH<sub>1</sub>-k-*); in the Latin and Greek forms, the *-k-* fulfils different functions (Untermann 1993: 468). For *rūpī* see Meiser (2003: 203) (root *\*rewp-*).

<sup>36</sup> Later, however, there are *s*-perfects which oust older *u/w*-perfects, e.g. *sorpsī* for earlier *sorbui*.

<sup>37</sup> *Nocēre* and *monċere* go back to causatives with *o*-grade roots and *\*-eye/o-*; they were resegmented as *ye/o*-presents.

present stems *iūuā-* and *sine-* or the participle stems *iū-to-* and *ſi-to-* are not possible.

The vowel quantities of the rhotacized forms are clear because the root vowels are in open syllables and thus metre helps us. *Noxīt* presumably has *-ō-* like the present, the perfect, and the past participle. The same is true of the *-ā-* in *rapsit*, which undergoes weakening in the compound *surrepsit*.<sup>38</sup>

There are five verbs in group 4: *ēmō* with *empsim*, *incendō* with *incēnsit*, *occīdō* with *occīsīt*, *spondeō* with *spōnsīs*, and *tangō* with *tāxīs*. Here the Latin perfects go back to Proto-Italic reduplicating perfects. This is obvious for *spondeō*—*spopondī* and *tangō*—*tetigī*. In *occīdō*—*occīdī* the reduplication was lost as in all compounds, but can still be seen in the base verb *caedō*—*cecīdī*. *Ēmī*, the long-vowel perfect of *ēmō*, was originally reduplicating (\**H<sub>1</sub>e-H<sub>1</sub>m-ēri* > *ēmēre* ‘they bought’); it is only the loss of laryngeals that has obscured this. Finally, Meiser (2003: 212) argues that *accendere* had a reduplicating perfect and that the reduplication was lost by syncope. The same should hold for *incendere*. We do not always know what aorist formation these verbs had in Proto-Italic. Only if the aorists were sigmatic is it possible that the sigmatic futures and subjunctives were formed from the aorist stem. However, Meiser (2003: 256) claims that if a verb had a sigmatic aorist next to a perfect in Proto-Italic, Latin usually retained the aorist stem and gave up the perfect stem. If this is correct, the perfects in group 4 had only non-sigmatic aorists beside them.<sup>39</sup> In this case, the sigmatic futures and subjunctives are late formations that were created from the present or the past participle stems.

The quantities of the root syllables are clear for the most part: in *incēnsīt* and *spōnsīs*, the vowels are lengthened before *-ns-*, and in *tāxīs* the *-a-* is probably long because of Lachmann’s law. *Occīsīt* must have long *-ī-* because the present and the perfect participle stem have long vowels as well. Only in the case of *empsim* and its compound *surempsīt* is it impossible to tell the quantity of the *-e-*. If the forms are derived from the present stem *ēm-*, it should be short, but if they are derived from the participle stem, it should be long, as in *ēemptum*.

<sup>38</sup> Alternatively, the sigmatic form is derived late, after vowel weakening, from the past participle.

<sup>39</sup> *Tagam* in Pacuu. *trag.* 165 seems to continue such an aorist.

Four forms remain. *Āxim* and *cāpsit* belong to *āgō—ēgī* and *cāpiō—cēpī*. The perfect forms are problematic,<sup>40</sup> but presumably sigmatic aorists would have been retained instead of the attested forms if they had existed. The sigmatic futures and subjunctives should thus be late derivations of the present or perfect participle stems.

*Āxim*, like the past participle, probably has a long root vowel by Lachmann's law, compare *adāxint* without vowel weakening. Even if the sigmatic compound form was created after the vowel weakening, it is unlikely that we have *adāxint* with short root vowel. After all, the form stands next to *adāctum* and must have been influenced by it, and even if there was no such influence, speakers must have felt, because of many other examples, that the shift from /g/ to /k/ entailed lengthening of the preceding vowel. *Cāpsit* has the -ā- of the present or the past participle stem, compare *occēpsō*, which underwent the regular weakening or was formed late from the weakened past participle.

If *ūlsō* in Acc. *trag.* 293 has been restored correctly, it cannot be derived from a sigmatic aorist because *ūlcīscī* lacks active perfect forms. However, the present also has deponent inflexion, and the active ending of the sigmatic future is odd. Presumably *ūlcīscī* sometimes had active inflexion, although this is only attested once, in Enn. *scaen.* 147, where we find *ūlcīscerem*. *Ūlsō* could be formed from the present stem, although the exact derivation would have to remain unclear. Perhaps it is easiest to get *ulsō* from the past participle: *fac-tus* : *fac-sō* = *ul-tus* : *ul-sō*. The *u-* in *ulsō* must be short because it is short in the present as well as in the past participle.

The form *dēlisit* occurs in *CGL* v. 61. 9 and is paraphrased as *dēlēberit*, which must be *dēlēuerit*, and as *inquināuerit*. From the gloss it is not clear whether the sigmatic form belongs to *dēlēre* or *dēlinere*. *Dēlēre* is a young verb based on *dēlēuī*, the perfect of *dēlinere*. If the sigmatic form belongs to *dēlēre*, we should read *dēlēssit*, compare the equally recent *prohibēssis* from *prohibēre*; there would be nothing strange about the form. If the sigmatic form belongs to *dēlinere*, the situation is more complicated. *Dēlēuī* replaces an *s*-aorist.<sup>41</sup> Our form cannot be traced back to a modal form of such an *s*-aorist: *\*dēlē-s-e-t* should have yielded a rhotacized form, †*dēlērit*. We could try to

<sup>40</sup> See Meiser (2003: 196–7 with 207 and 198–9) for *ēgī* and *cēpī*, respectively.

<sup>41</sup> This in turn substitutes for a root aorist, see Meiser (2003: 226).

derive the form from the past participle by analogy: *fac-tus: fac-sit :: dēlī-tus: dēlīsīt*. Such a form could only have escaped rhotacism if it was created after the fourth century BC. Perhaps the easiest alternative is to derive the form from the present stem: *dēlīn-s-it* could be ancient or a recent invention by a poet, and the nasal before the -s- would not be written.

To sum up, it was my goal to find out whether the various sigmatic formations were old or recent. I divided them into four groups: (1) forms whose regular perfects continue sigmatic aorists; (2) forms whose perfects continue non-sigmatic aorists; (3) forms with *u/w*-perfects; (4) forms whose regular perfects continue reduplicating perfects. In group (1), the Proto-Italic *s*-aorists are still plainly visible, and in group (3) the new past forms seem to replace old *s*-aorists. Thus it is possible that the sigmatic forms belonging to verbs of groups (1) and (3) directly continue modal forms of old *s*-aorists. However, some of them could also be more recent formations. Verbs belonging to groups (2) and (4) never had sigmatic aorists. The sigmatic formations must be relatively young in these cases; they are either formed from the present stem or from the past participle stem, after the sigmatic formation lost its connection to the *s*-aorist and became independent. It is hard to be more specific. This relative chronology cannot really be supplemented with absolute points in time. We know that vowel weakening must have taken place in the sixth or fifth century BC (see Meiser 1998: 66). Forms like *effexis* show its effects. However, we cannot tell if *effexis* was created before the weakening and then underwent it, or whether it was formed later on, from the participle *effectum*, which is old and had undergone weakening. Rhotacized forms like *moneris* must have been created before rhotacism, but since rhotacism is such a late phenomenon (usually dated to the 4th c. BC), this does not mean much.

#### SOME PROBLEMS CONCERNING *DVIM* AND *DEM*

In Ch. 9 I argued that the type *duim* functions like aoristic subjunctives of the type *faxim*. *Dem*, on the other hand, does not differ in usage from regular present subjunctives such as *faciam*. As

\**deH<sub>3</sub>*- ‘give’ is a telic root, it should have a root aorist and a derived present in Indo-European. This state of affairs is preserved in Sanskrit and Greek, both of which form reduplicated presents.<sup>42</sup> Since aoristic origin is likely for *duim*, the lack of reduplication is normal. By contrast, the absence of reduplication in *dem* is surprising, especially since the present stem of this verb is reduplicating in Oscan and Umbrian as well. In this section, I shall try to account for the discrepancy between form and meaning of *dem*. From a purely formal perspective, *duim* is not without problems either. The *u*-element has always puzzled scholars, and no entirely satisfactory explanation of its origin has been put forward so far. This second difficulty is without consequences for my functional analysis. I shall not suggest any solutions to it, but shall merely review some of the proposals.

I shall begin with the questions concerning the *u*-element. The compounds *interdare* and *crēdere* have extra-paradigmatic *ī*-subjunctives, *interduim* and *crēduīs*. Synchronically, they can both be regarded as compounds of *dare*, but diachronically only *interdare* contains the same root as *dare* (Indo-European \**deH<sub>3</sub>*- ‘give’, cf. Greek δί-δω-μι and Sanskrit *da-dā-mi*). *Crēdere* is derived from the root \**d<sup>h</sup>eH<sub>1</sub>*- ‘put’ (cf. Greek τί-θη-μι and Sanskrit *da-d<sup>h</sup>ā-mi*). In Latin, the unextended form of this root survives only in compounds.<sup>43</sup> The first problem that arises is whether the *u*-element began in the root \**deH<sub>3</sub>*- and then spread to compounds of \**d<sup>h</sup>eH<sub>1</sub>*- that could be analysed as belonging to *dare*, or whether it was the other way round. In order to find out, I shall look at some regular sound changes.

Latin preserved word-internal \**-d-*, but changed \**-d<sup>h</sup>-* to \**-ð-* and then to *-d-* unless it was next to *-u-*, *-r-*, or *-l-*, where \**-ð-* became \**-v-* and then *-b-*, see Meiser (1998: 104–5). While the change from \**-d<sup>h</sup>-* to \**-ð-* seems to have taken place in Proto-Italic, the change from \**-ð-* to stops happened in the history of Latin; Oscan, Umbrian, and Faliscan have preserved fricatives in most places.<sup>44</sup> The morphological and semantic merger of \**deH<sub>3</sub>*- and \**d<sup>h</sup>eH<sub>1</sub>*- in compounds presupposes

<sup>42</sup> The Greek aorist ἔ-δω-χα has, however, a new *χ*-element.

<sup>43</sup> The non-compounded verb *facere* contains the extended root \**d<sup>h</sup>eH<sub>1</sub>-k-* in the *Ø*-grade.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Latin *medius* versus Oscan *mefiāi* (Cippus Abellanus, Cm 1/CA B 31) < \**med<sup>h</sup>yo-* < \**med<sup>h</sup>yo-* (Sanskrit *mad<sup>h</sup>ya-*). After nasals, the voiced aspirates have stops as their reflexes in Umbrian, see Meiser (1986: 75–6).

the merger of  $*-d-$  and  $*-d^h-$  and is consequently restricted to Latin. Umbrian has forms like *purdouitu* (3rd pers. sg. future imperative, 'let him offer', Tabulae Iguvinae, Um 1. vi. a 56). They are undoubtedly compounds of 'give' rather than 'put'. Therefore, the  $u$ -extension must originally have belonged to the root  $*deH_3-$  and must have spread to the root  $*d^heH_1-$  after the Proto-Italic unity broke up.

It is unclear until when the  $u$ -forms continued to spread. Meiser (1998: 66) thinks that vowel weakening in syllables other than the first took place in the sixth/fifth century BC. *Interdare* with  $-ā-$  instead of  $-ē-$  must have been formed after the weakening. Since it has the form *interduō/interduim* beside it, it could be argued that the  $u$ -forms were still spreading after the fifth century, unless the irregular forms are old and the regular ones are later, analogical formations.

The next problem is how and when the root  $*deH_3-$  acquired its  $u$ -extension. The  $-u-$  is unlikely to be of Indo-European date: Cowgill (1964) argues convincingly that only Italic has this  $u$ -element as part of the root. Thus the  $u$ -forms are 'under strong suspicion of being an Italic creation' (Cowgill 1964: 356), and I can restrict my analysis to Italic.

There are several ways of deriving the  $-u-$ . Godel (1979: 233) regards it as a reflex of  $*-H_3-$  before vowel, while  $*-H_3-$  before consonant does not leave any labial traces. Most people would agree with the second statement, while the first is more controversial and does not convince me.<sup>45</sup> Godel himself starts from the first person singular optative, and so shall I. If one takes the full grade of the optative suffix,  $*-yeH_1-$ ,  $*-H_3-$  in  $*dH_3-yeH_1-m$  or  $*deH_3-yeH_1-m$  stands before a consonant and cannot leave any labial traces. If one takes the  $\emptyset$ -grade of the suffix,  $*-iH_1-$ , there is  $*dH_3-iH_1-m$  if one starts from a  $\emptyset$ -grade root or  $*deH_3-iH_1-m$  if one starts from an  $e$ -grade root. According to Godel, these forms yield  $*dāwīm$  and  $*dāwīm$ , and  $*dāwīm$  in compounds results in  $-duim$  by syncope, whence we get non-compounded *duim*. As it is impossible to get *duim* from  $*dāwīm$ , I can deal with this form briskly. I do not think that the sound change  $eH_3 > āw$  exists before a vowel. The Greek evidence for it is meagre

<sup>45</sup> The theory that  $*-H_3-$  can leave labial traces goes back to Martinet (1955: 216–18), who thinks that the relationship between  $*H_2$  and  $*H_3$  is the same as that between  $*k$  and  $*k^w$ , i.e.  $*H_3$  is  $*H_2$  with a labial element.

(Cowgill 1960: 148–50), and the few examples that we seem to have come from Latin: the root  $*b^hleH_3-$  gives us *flōrus* and *flāuus*,  $*g^neH_3-$  yields (g)*nōscō* and (g)*nāuus*, and  $*g^hreH_3-$  survives in *rāuus*. The variants with  $-\bar{o}-$  are before consonant, and those with  $-\bar{a}w-$  seem to be before vowel.  $-w-$  could be explained as coming from  $*H_3$ , but we might simply have a *wo*-suffix, see Schrijver (1991: 154–7).  $*-eH_3w-$  would give us  $*-\bar{o}w-$ , and the data support a Latin sound change  $-\bar{o}w- > -\bar{a}w-$ , see Szemerényi (1987a: 602–7). Since the ordinal numbers from seven to ten seem to be thematized cardinal numbers, it is probably best not to derive *octāuus* from  $*H_3oktoH_3wo-s$ , as Meiser (1998: 67) suggests. However, we need not start from  $*H_3oktoH_3o-s$  either. It has been argued that the proto-forms were  $*H_3oktoH_3w$  and  $*H_3oktoH_3wo-s$ , respectively.<sup>46</sup> *Octō* would then be a sandhi-variant of  $*oktōu$ .

The only other potential arguments in favour of  $-w-$  as a reflex of  $*-H_3-$  in Latin are the *u/w*-perfects and *duim*. The origins of the *u/w*-perfect, however, are too obscure, so these forms should not be considered here. This leaves us with *duim* as the only case where  $*-H_3-$  could have such a reflex, which is not a very firm basis for establishing a sound change. Moreover, Godel wants *duim* to come from  $*dawīm < *dH_3-iH_1-m$ . It seems to me that  $*-H_3-$  in  $*dH_3-iH_1-m$  can hardly be syllabic, and one expects  $†dim$  as its outcome. The only way of getting *dawīm* from  $*dH_3-iH_1-m$  is to assume that  $*dH_3-iH_1-m$  had a Lindeman variant with syllabic  $*-H_3-$ .<sup>47</sup> I find this hard to believe.

At first sight, Bammesberger's approach (1984: 78–9) seems very appealing because of its simplicity. Since the athematic optative has a  $\emptyset$ -grade root, we expect a first person singular  $*dH-yeH-m$  and a first person plural  $*dH-iH-me$ . The first person singular has syllabic  $*-H-$  between consonants and yields  $*dayēm > *daēm > dem$ , but in the plural the laryngeal of the root is lost because it is before a vowel and consequently non-syllabic. We should get  $†dīme$ , and the connection

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Vedic *aṣṭā*, *aṣṭāu* 'eight', which was influenced by *dvā*, *dvāu* 'two'. Gothic *ahtau* 'eight' and *ahtuda* 'the eighth' are less clear.

<sup>47</sup> Many Indo-European words must have had two initial consonants, the first of which could not be syllabic, such as  $*d-$ , and the second of which could be syllabic under certain circumstances, such as  $*-y-$ ; Lindeman variants are those forms of such words in which the second consonant was syllabic, yielding onsets like  $*di-$ .

with the root *\*dō-* would be opaque. Therefore, the full-grade root is introduced secondarily, and *\*dō-ī-mos* gives us *duīmus*.

There are various problems with Bammesberger's suggestions. First, it remains unclear how the Umbrian forms or Faliscan *douiad* ('*det*', Ve 241) can be derived. *Douiad* is the present subjunctive of a *ye/o-*verb belonging to the conjugation class iii. *b* (like Latin *capiō*) or iv (like Latin *audiō*). I do not think that *\*dō-ye/o-* would yield a root *\*dōw-* or *\*dōw-* in Faliscan. Besides, there are formal problems even if one restricts oneself to Latin. To begin with, the exact development of a sequence *\*-ō-ī-* in Latin is unclear because there are no parallels. Even if one accepts *\*-ō-ī- > -uī-*, it is not clear where Bammesberger gets *\*dō-* from: does it come from the root aorist *\*(e)-dō-m*? Loss of *\*-y-* between vowels probably took place as early as Proto-Italic, and *\*dēm < \*daēm < \*dayēm* is just as opaque as †*dīme* from *\*dH-iH-me*. Why is *\*dēm* not replaced by something clearer? After all, this is what happens in the case of †*dīme*. Moreover, there are functional difficulties. *Dem* behaves like a normal present subjunctive, while *duim* has distributional properties that make aoristic origin likely. If we were to follow Bammesberger, we should get a singular *dem < \*dH-yeH-m* and a plural *duīmus* from *\*dō-ī-mos* replacing †*dīme < \*dH-iH-me*, both in the same paradigm. We could then create *dēmus* from *dem* and *duim* from *duīmus*. The functional differences between *dem* and *duim* which I found in Ch. 9 would be secondary. However, while functional differences may sometimes arise as the result of purely phonological or morphological processes,<sup>48</sup> they are so peculiar in this case that they are more likely to be inherited.

It now seems that we cannot derive the forms with *-u-* from *\*deH<sub>3</sub>-* by regular sound changes. Moreover, even if the sound laws did work, the Latin forms still behave so differently from regular present subjunctives without *-u-* that they are not likely to have been part of the same tense or aspect stem, *pace* Bammesberger. Thus it is perhaps easier if we posit for Italic an alternative root with the same lexical meaning, but with *-u-*. Should we reconstruct it as *\*dew-* or as

<sup>48</sup> An example of secondary functional differentiation is *\*deywos*. The nom. sg. regularly developed into *deus*, while the gen. sg. turned into *dīuī*. *Deus* then became a noun, whereas *dīuī* became an adjective, and both acquired complete paradigms (*deus* – *deī* and *dīuus* – *dīuī*). (Occasionally, *dīuus* is of course substantivized, but its main function is adjectival.)

\**dewH<sub>x</sub>*-? Meiser (1986: 187) convincingly argues for \**dewH<sub>x</sub>*- with a laryngeal because we have an Umbrian perfect passive participle *purditom* (Tabulae Iguuinae, Um 1. vii. a 45). In the perfect passive participle the root should have the Ø-grade, which would be \*-*dū*- if we start from \*-*dew*-, but \*-*duH<sub>x</sub>*- if we start from \**dewH<sub>x</sub>*-. \*-*dū*- cannot turn into -*di*-, but the regular outcome of \*-*duH<sub>x</sub>*- is -*dī*- (via \*-*dū*-).<sup>49</sup>

According to Meiser, there are two ways of deriving a root \**dewH<sub>x</sub>*-:

1. A *u*-stem noun ‘gift’ was formed from \**deH<sub>3</sub>*- ‘give’. The oblique cases had non-syllabic \*-*w*-, so the oblique stem was \**deH<sub>3</sub>w*-. Laryngeal metathesis<sup>50</sup> led to \**dewH<sub>3</sub>*-, which then functioned as a new verbal root \**dewH<sub>3</sub>*-.<sup>51</sup>
2. \**deH<sub>3</sub>*- had an alternative root shape \**dew*-, just as \**sterH<sub>3</sub>*-<sup>52</sup> had an alternative root \**strew*-.<sup>53</sup> \**dewH<sub>x</sub>*- is a contaminated form of \**deH<sub>3</sub>*- and \**dew*-.

Neither of these two solutions is without problems. The main difficulty with (1) is that it is such a complicated derivation. Is *duim* supposed to be a regular denominative? Most of them belong to the first and fourth conjugations. (2) is simpler in this respect, but it should be noted that *duim* was considered a special form of *dare*—after all, *duim* does not form a complete paradigm—while *struere* and *sternere* are separate lexemes and do form complete paradigms. Moreover, \**sterH<sub>3</sub>*- and \**strew*- can both be regarded as extensions of an original root \**ster*-, while \**deH<sub>3</sub>*- and \**dew*- cannot go back to a simple root †*de*-; there are no Indo-European roots that contain just one consonant.

<sup>49</sup> Proto-Italic \*-*ū*- regularly becomes Umbrian -*ī*-, cf. Umbrian *mani* (Tabulae Iguuinae, Um 1. vi. b 24) and Latin *manū*, both from \**manū*.

<sup>50</sup> There are not many examples of laryngeal metathesis in Latin. The root \**d<sup>h</sup>eH<sub>1</sub>*- *i*- ‘suck’ without the *i*-extension survives in Latin *fēlāre* ‘suck’. The Ø-grade root with the *i*-extension is \**d<sup>h</sup>H<sub>1</sub>**i*-, which turns into \**d<sup>h</sup>iH<sub>1</sub>*- by laryngeal metathesis and is preserved in Latin *fīlius* ‘son’ (originally ‘suckling’).

<sup>51</sup> In some respects, Latin *seruāre*, which seems to be a denominative verb, is a parallel. According to Rix (1994a: 77–9), the Indo-European root \**ser*- ‘watch over’ formed a noun in \*-*wo*- in Italic, from which the Latin verb is derived.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. *sternimus* < \**sternamos* < \**ster-n-H<sub>3</sub>-mos*.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. *struimus* < \**strew-o-mos*.

If we accept a root *\*dewH<sub>3</sub>-* despite these considerable difficulties, forms like *duint* can be derived easily. The optative of root aorists has a Ø-grade root; *\*duH<sub>3</sub>-iH<sub>1</sub>-mos* becomes *duīmus* by regular sound change, and the laryngeal insures that we have syllabic *\*-u-* rather than non-syllabic *\*-w-*, which should result in †*bīmus*.

We can now turn to the problem of the regular present subjunctives *dem*, *dēs* etc. In Indo-European, the root *\*deH<sub>3</sub>-* ‘give’ is telic and forms a root aorist (cf. Greek ἔ-δω-χα, Sanskrit *á-dā-t*), but a reduplicating present (cf. Greek δί-δω-μι with *i*-reduplication, Sanskrit *da-dā-mi* with *e*-reduplication). In Oscan and Umbrian, the present is also reduplicating (Oscan *di-de-s-t* in the Tabula Bantina, Lu 1/TB 16, ‘*dabit*’, Umbrian *di-rs-a* in the Tabulae Iguinae, Um 1. v. b 13 < *\*di-d-ā-t* ‘*det*’). It is only in Latin that the present does not have reduplication. According to LLF 527–8, the present was in fact reduplicating in pre-Latin. The non-reduplicating *dare* is taken from the compounds, where the reduplication was lost by syncope. If this is correct, the functional differences between *dem* (present) and *duim* (aorist) are easy to explain. However, there are chronological problems (Meiser 2003: 105–6): since all polysyllabic present stems lost ablaut differences as early as Proto-Italic, the preserved ablaut difference between *dās* and *dātis* cannot be explained if we derive the forms from compounds with reduplication.<sup>54</sup> Meiser therefore assumes that these forms go back to the non-reduplicating aorist paradigm. He starts from the aorist optative *\*dH<sub>3</sub>-yeH<sub>1</sub>-t* > *\*dāyēt* > *det*, which was non-past and could be reinterpreted as a present form. Equally possible is what Bammesberger (1984: 76) argues for: the aorist imperative *\*dH<sub>3</sub>-te* > *dāte* is reinterpreted as a present tense and becomes the basis for a new present *dāmus*. *Dēmus* would then be the subjunctive of this new present. The reanalysis of the aorist imperative as a present form may have been facilitated by presents like *reddō*, which go back to *\*re-didō* etc., but are not reduplicating from a synchronic point of view; this would presuppose either that the reduplication was lost relatively early, or

<sup>54</sup> *Dās* keeps the vowel length but changes its vowel quantity; the earlier form must have been *\*dōs* < *\*deH<sub>3</sub>-s*. The change in vowel quantity is by analogy to *dātis* < *\*dH<sub>3</sub>-tes*. Nevertheless, the quantitative distinction still shows very clearly that there used to be ablaut.

that the aorist stem of this verb had kept an imperative relatively long.

What Meiser's and Bammesberger's approaches have in common is that the lack of reduplication in the Latin present forms of *\*deH<sub>3</sub>-* is explained by deriving them from aorists which were reinterpreted as presents. This must have taken place in the history of Latin, after the Proto-Italic unity broke up. Such approaches pose no difficulties for the functional analysis in Ch. 9 as long as we assume that *dem* kept no aoristic traces. If we follow Meiser, it is not entirely clear why the aoristic pre-form of *dem* should become a present, but not that of *duim*; after all, the roots are semantically identical and only differ in the *\*-w-*. Maybe the *\*w*-forms were already too isolated and restricted to futures (< subjunctives) and to subjunctives (< optatives). If we follow Bammesberger, the indicative *dāmus* and the subjunctive *dēmus* are based on *dāte* after its semantic change from aorist to present imperative, and consequently they must have had present meaning from the beginning.

I shall now summarize. The *-u-* in forms like *duim*, *interduim*, or *crēduās* began in the root *\*deH<sub>3</sub>-* 'give' rather than in *\*d<sup>h</sup>eH<sub>1</sub>-* 'put', to which it spread later. The *u*-extension cannot be derived by sound changes. We must reconstruct an alternative root *\*dewH<sub>x</sub>-* 'give', which differed from *\*deH<sub>3</sub>-* only in having a *u*-extension. *Duim* goes back to the aorist optative of this expanded root. Since *\*deH<sub>3</sub>-* formed a reduplicating present in Indo-European and Proto-Italic, the regular present subjunctive *dem* looks like an aorist form as well. This raises the question how we can explain the functional differences between *duim* and *dem*. Here there are two possibilities. One could argue that *dem* started as a true aorist optative that was reinterpreted as a present form, whereas *duim*, though being an aorist as well, did not undergo reanalysis. Alternatively, a new present *dās/dātis* was formed from the reanalysed imperative *dāte* (aorist > present). *Dem*, the subjunctive of this new present, had present meaning from the beginning. I can now explain the absence of †*redduim*; in Ch. 9 I argued that it can hardly be due to chance. *Reddō* goes back to a reduplicated present *\*re-didō* (LLF 527), while *dō* formally continues an aorist. The *u*-forms belong to the aorist paradigm, so it is natural that there is old *duim*, but not inherited †*redduim*.

## SUMMARY

In this chapter I examined some diachronic problems presented by the extra-paradigmatic verb forms. While my synchronic analyses of these forms in Chs. 6–10 were to a large extent original, the various hypotheses discussed in this chapter had for the most part already been advanced by other scholars. What is strange, however, is the fact that the majority of these scholars had made their diachronic analyses without previous examination of synchronic semantics. This striking omission made it worthwhile to re-examine some of the problems in order to see if the synchronic analyses of the preceding chapters could shed some light on them.

This was certainly the case for the first problem. It is impossible to decide whether the *-s-* in *fac-s-ō* goes back to an aorist or a desiderative marker by merely looking at the morphology. The synchronic distribution patterns of the sigmatic forms, on the other hand, speak very clearly for the aorist hypothesis.

Synchronic analyses cannot help to explain the *-ss-* in *amā-ss-ō*. I tried to show that purely phonological explanations do not work and argued that the analogy in *LLF* is still the best solution: *dīxem* : *dīxō* :: *amāssem* : *amāssō*.

Not all sigmatic forms can be equally old. In the third section I examined what forms are based on Proto-Italic sigmatic aorists and what forms must be more recent by looking at the present, perfect, and supine stems of these verbs. Perhaps the most important result is that the most frequent form, *faxō*, is relatively young.

Subjunctives like *duim* and *dem* present two problems: how can the *-u-* in *duim* be explained, and why is *dem* not reduplicated like the forms of the present stems in Oscan and Umbrian? The origin of the *-u-* has to remain problematic, but it seems to be of Proto-Italic age and arose in the root *\*deH<sub>3</sub>-* ‘give’ rather than *\*d<sup>h</sup>eH<sub>1</sub>-* ‘place, put’. It has been suggested that *dem* goes back to an aorist form that has been reanalysed as a present. This is a possible solution, but it has to be said that *dem* has not kept any aoristic meaning at all.

## Extra-Paradigmatic Forms in Classical and Later Latin

IN Part I of this book I examined some problems concerning the regular verb forms of Archaic Latin. This was done as a preliminary to Part II, in which I tried to find out how the extra-paradigmatic forms fit into the system. Part II was divided into five chapters: Chs. 6–8 dealt with the sigmatic futures, subjunctives, and infinitives, respectively; in Ch. 9 I turned to *ī*-subjunctives like *duim*, and in Ch. 10 to *ā*-subjunctives like *attigās*. Part III of this book is intended to add greater diachronic depth to the study of the extra-paradigmatic forms. The last chapter dealt with problems of reconstruction. Throughout that chapter it was my aim to show the importance of synchronic semantics for diachronic analyses of morphology. In this chapter I shall be looking in the opposite direction. The questions I shall be addressing are how many of the forms discussed in Part II survive in Classical Latin and later on, and if there is a pattern to what survives and what does not. These are topics which for some reason have never been investigated systematically.

All extra-paradigmatic forms are rare even in Terence, by which time they can with some justification be considered doublets of the regular ones. Their loss is inevitable because they have no functions that could not be fulfilled by other forms and because they are not integrated into regular paradigms. After Terence, the extra-paradigmatic forms are mainly used for stylistic reasons: Virgil employs them in order to make his language more solemn; Livy has them in speeches in order to recreate an archaic atmosphere; and Apuleius

seems to use extra-paradigmatic forms predominantly in order to show off his learning.

The fact that the extra-paradigmatic forms are lost is obvious. What is more interesting is how they are lost since this has repercussions on our understanding of how we remember lexical items and how languages die out. There are two questions that are particularly important in this connection:

1. What forms die out first? In general, irregular forms tend to be lost before the regular ones, but from a synchronic point of view, all the extra-paradigmatic forms are irregular. Thus it could be either the least frequent ones which are eliminated first, or those which are of greater morphological opacity than the others.
2. How are those forms preserved which survive for some time? Are they memorized as fixed phrases like *fors fuat an* and in certain construction types like *faxō* + present subjunctive? And what is their relationship to the regular forms? Are they remembered as separate items, or are they stored as alternative word shapes, for example of the type *faxint* = *faciant*?

The first of these questions is hard to answer because it is always difficult to argue from gaps in what is attested. Especially when forms are rare anyway, the absence of a certain item may be fortuitous. Here the Roman grammarians can sometimes afford us some help. The forms they explain are likely to be problematic or at least interesting for the native speakers of their time. If they do not gloss a form, there may be several explanations. They may be citing a passage from Archaic Latin which they find interesting for other reasons, in which case the absence of remarks about the extra-paradigmatic form could be due to chance. If, however, they cite sentences from Archaic Latin and consistently fail to gloss some types of extra-paradigmatic forms they contain, we may assume that the forms either presented no difficulties, or that the grammarians did not understand them either.

In order to answer the second question, we have to look for recurrent phrases and construction types. We may also find instances of 'wrong' usage, for example of *faxō* with a single accusative instead

of the double accusative or the future/subjunctive. This would show that *faxō*, which used to share many properties of *faciam*, was equated with it completely and took on its constructions.

In the sections that follow, I have collected forms partly by reading texts myself, partly by looking them up in Neue and Wagener (1897), and partly by using the *BTL*. The *BTL* contains texts until around AD 800; the total of words is roughly 8.2 million. In this way I have probably found most of the forms that exist in Latin texts; if I have missed one or the other, it will not affect my results significantly.

## THE SIGMATIC INDICATIVES AND SUBJUNCTIVES

I examined sigmatic indicatives in Archaic Latin in Ch. 6, and their subjunctival counterparts in Ch. 7. Now I shall first look at *faxō* in main clauses in the classical and post-classical language and then at the remaining indicatives in subordinate clauses. After that, I shall examine the sigmatic forms of *audēre* and the other sigmatic subjunctives. Finally, I shall turn to the grammarians and other authors that cite sigmatic forms.

### Main Clause *faxō*

As I showed in Ch. 6, the only sigmatic indicative form in main clauses in Archaic Latin is the fossilized *faxō*, which functions either as a causative or as a marker of certainty. *Faxō* is most frequently combined with the simple future, but it also freely takes the plain present subjunctive; there is only one instance of *faxō* with *ut* + present subjunctive. A few times, we find *faxō* with the future perfect, and once with the perfect subjunctive, which has past meaning. In its causative function, *faxō* can also take the double accusative. Main clause *faxō* does not belong to a higher register in Archaic Latin.

In Classical Latin and later on, we find only one instance, in Petronius, where *faxō* does not necessarily belong to an elevated stylistic level:

(1) (The lodging-house keeper arrives with the next course of the dinner. He had too much to drink and is in a bad mood, thinking that Eumolpus and his companions want to leave without paying.)

Iam enim *faxō sciātis* nōn uiduae hanc īsulam esse sed M. Mannīcīi. (Petron. 95. 3.)

Indeed, I *shall see to it* that you *know* that this block of flats does not belong to a widow, but to M. Mannicius.

Petersmann (1977: 174) argues that Ex. 1 is in colloquial language. If so, this might be an instance of *faxō* surviving in the spoken language. However, threats<sup>1</sup> are often couched in legal language, and Petersmann (1977: 254) also points out that *enim* in the meaning 'indeed' is normally old-fashioned in the classical period and later on.<sup>2</sup> At any rate, the distribution of the tokens elsewhere does not speak for a colloquialism: we have eighteen tokens in poetry<sup>3</sup> and eleven more in prose. Of the eleven tokens in prose, one is in Liu. 6. 35. 9 (in a speech), one is in Fronto p. 153. 4, one in Claud. Mam. *epist.* 1 p. 199. 1, and eight instances are in Apuleius,<sup>4</sup> whose mannered style heavily draws on Plautus. In each of these cases, the form seems to be a deliberate archaism belonging to a higher register. If it is not yet dead in the spoken language, it is at least dying out.

Some of the constructions of *faxō* that we find in Archaic Latin are decidedly odd from a classical and also an archaic perspective. *Faxō* with the simple future or the future perfect is a construction that does not have any parallels in Classical Latin, nor in Archaic Latin for that matter. *Faxō* with the plain subjunctive does have a parallel in *fac* + subjunctive, but the future *faciam* is more regularly combined with *ut*. How is *faxō* construed in Classical Latin? If we assumed that speakers always learn moribund forms in fixed phrases, we should expect *faxō* to be most frequently combined with future

<sup>1</sup> See Eumolpus' reaction in 95. 4: *etiam mināris?*, 'are you actually threatening me?'

<sup>2</sup> Kroon does not comment on the passage, but states that *enim* can be used to reinforce statements (1995: 202).

<sup>3</sup> They are in Verg. *Aen.* 9. 154, 12. 316; Ou. *met.* 3. 271, 12. 594; Sen. *Med.* 905; Val. Fl. 4. 191, 220, 5. 654, 7. 177; Stat. *Theb.* 5. 658, 8. 78; Sil. 1. 479, 4. 812, 7. 115, 17. 235; Prud. *perist.* 5. 101, *psych.* 249; Claud. 20. 143.

<sup>4</sup> Apul. *met.* 1. 12, 25, 4. 6, 25, 30, 5. 30, 6. 23, 8. 12.

tenses. However, this is not the case. We only find one instance of *faxō* with a future perfect:

- (2) (Lycurgus, king of Nemea, is angry with Hypsipyle from Lemnos.)

*Faxo* omnis fābula Lemnī  
et pater et tumidae generis mendācia sacri  
*exciderint*. (Stat. *Theb.* 5. 658–60.)

I *shall take care* that all the story about Lemnos, her father, and the lies about a divine race *shall have perished* from the memory of this arrogant woman.

*Exciderint* refers to the future and thus cannot be a perfect subjunctive; the perfect subjunctive with *faxō* has past reference and is only possible under special circumstances, see Ch. 6. Here we must be dealing with a future perfect.

There is also one instance of *faxō* taking the double accusative as in Archaic Latin, namely in Claud. Mam. *epist.* 1 p. 199. 1–3. Yet the most frequent type in Classical Latin and later on is *faxō* + plain subjunctive, which occurs in twenty-five out of the thirty tokens we have. Presumably the writers did not feel comfortable with *faxō* + simple future because this type did not exist anywhere else in the language. Futures like *faciam* do not often take the plain subjunctive in Classical Latin, but the construction is grammatical and seems to be a compromise because it exists in both Archaic Latin and the classical language, even though it is not the most frequent one at either stage of the language. Since *ut* is absent in twenty-five out of the twenty-seven cases where *faxō* takes clausal complements in the subjunctive, it makes sense to argue that speakers learnt construction types rather than equations of the type *faxō* = *faciam* because *faciam* normally takes *ut*. However, there is also one token each of *faxō ut*<sup>5</sup> (Sil. 17. 235) and *faxō nē* (Liu. 6. 35. 9),<sup>6</sup> which seems to indicate that *faxō* was at least sometimes simply equated with *faciam*. This is certainly the case in Verg. *Aen.* 12. 316 (*ego foedera faxō* ‘I shall make treaties’), where *faxō* is construed in a way that would not be possible in Archaic Latin: it selects a single accusative and is not causative.

<sup>5</sup> *Faxō* takes *ut* only once in Archaic Latin (*Asin.* 897).

<sup>6</sup> Oakley (1997: 714) believes that this is colloquial because of the parallel in Petron. 95. 3, but see my remarks on that passage above.

## Sigmatic Indicatives in Subordinate Clauses

As was argued in Ch. 6, the sigmatic indicatives in subordinate clauses in Archaic Latin function as future perfects belonging to a higher register. Of the fifty-three sigmatic futures in Plautine subordinate clauses, twelve belong to the verb *facere* and two to a compound of it, *efficere*. The only sigmatic future that Terence has in a subordinate clause is *faxis* in *Andr.* 753. Consequently we should expect that if any sigmatic forms survived, it would be those of *facere*. *Facere* does indeed have several sigmatic tokens in Classical Latin and the post-classical language, but there are also some other sigmatic indicatives in literature: *clepsit*, *cooptāssint*, *creāssit*, *imperāssit*, *(ir-)rogāssit*, *iūdicāssit*, *iūrāssit*, *iussō*, *locāssint*, *migrāssit*, *prohibēssit*, *rapsit*, *receptō*, and *turbāssitur*.

Wherever sigmatic futures of *facere* or its compounds survive, they are in contexts where higher register is appropriate: we find *faxis* five times in laws<sup>7</sup> and once in Cic. *leg.* 2. 19 in imitation of somewhat old-fashioned legal language. Livy has eight sigmatic tokens of *facere* and one of *dēficere* (*dēfexit*), always in speeches and prayers.<sup>8</sup> And finally, the form *faxis* occurs twenty-seven times in a fixed prayer formula of the *frātrēs Aruālēs* (*ast tū ea ita faxis*, 'but if you shall have done so').

Other sigmatic futures are rare. Here we may wonder if they are really survivals from Archaic Latin or if some of them were created as deliberate archaisms. *Receptō* in Catull. 48. 19 may well be a genuinely old form because we find *capsō* in *Bacch.* 712. Similarly, *iussō* in Verg. *Aen.* 11. 467 and Sil. 12. 175 can be compared with *iussit* (= *iusserit*) in the Lex Sil. ap. Fest. p. 288. Livy has two relevant forms, *clepsit* and *cooptāssint*. Since they occur in formulae, they may be old, though at least the latter is easy to make up. In the inscription in *CIL* vi. 10298 we find two sigmatic types, *iūrāssit* (once) and *iūdicāssit* (twice). At least the former of these could be a true survival from the archaic period because there is a subjunctive *abiūrāssit* in *Persa* 478.

There are, moreover, fifteen tokens in Cic. *leg.*<sup>9</sup> Here Cicero is formulating the laws of the ideal state, and he deliberately does so

<sup>7</sup> *CIL* i<sup>2</sup>. 590. 4 and 34. iii. 1933. 7, vi. 10298. 7, xii. 4333. 15.

<sup>8</sup> *Dēfexit* occurs in Liu. 1. 24. 8. The other tokens are in 6. 41. 12, 22. 10. 4, 6 (three times), 23. 11. 1, 34. 4. 20, 36. 2. 5.

<sup>9</sup> 2. 21, 22 (twice), 3. 6 (four times), 9 (three times), 10 (twice), 11 (three times).

in language which has a slightly archaic ring to it,<sup>10</sup> as he himself says:

(3) (Cicero is explaining the purpose of *lĕgum lĕgēs uōce prōpōnere*, of ‘using “legalese” for the laws’.)

Sunt certa lĕgum uerba, Quīnte, neque ita prīscā ut in ueteribus XII sacrātisque lĕgibus, et tamen, quō plūs auctōritātis habeant, paulō antiquiōra quam hic sermō est. (Cic. *leg.* 2. 18.)

There are certain words of the laws, Quintus, not as pristine as those in the old Twelve Tables and the sacred laws,<sup>11</sup> but nevertheless slightly more archaic than our present language, so that they have more authority.

In these laws, Cicero uses three sigmatic futures of third-conjugation verbs, *iussit*, *rapsit*, and *clepsit*. All of them could have been known to him from archaic sources. *Iussit* occurs in the Lex Sil. ap. Fest. p. 288, the subjunctive *surrepsit* can be found in *Mil.* 333, and *clepsit* in Liu. 22. 10. 5 may be based on an old formula. Similarly, *prohibēssit* and *prohibēssint* have precedents in sigmatic subjunctives in Ennius (*scaen.* 239) and Plautus (*Aul.* 611 and *Pseud.* 14). The remaining nine sigmatic tokens belong to the verbs *creāre*, *imperāre*, (*ir-*)*rogāre*, *iūdicāre*, *locāre*, *migrāre*, and *turbāre*. It is not clear how many of them had sigmatic futures in Archaic Latin, but since they are all verbs of the first conjugation, it is not difficult to create the relevant sigmatic forms, something which cannot be said about all third-conjugation verbs. Cicero may thus have invented some of these forms himself. If so, this would indicate that not only the meaning, but also the morphology of first-conjugation sigmatic futures was clear to him.

I conclude this section with a curious inscription from Britain:

(4) nōmine Camŭlorīgi(s) et Titocun(a)e mōlam quam perdedērunt in fānum dēi dĕŭŭōi. Cuīcumque ŋ(ō)m[e]n *inuolāsīt* mōla(m) illam ut sa(n)guin(em) suum mittat ūsque diem quō moriātur. q(uī)cumque

<sup>10</sup> Powell (2005: 122–3) rightly stresses that while Cicero is using certain archaisms, it is not his aim to be as linguistically outdated as the Twelve Tables. There is one false archaism in the text: in 3. 10 (*ast potestās* etc.), there is only one conditional clause, which is introduced by *ast*. In proper Archaic Latin, on the other hand, *ast* ‘but if’ is only used in second protases, that is, a conditional clause or its equivalent has to precede, see H–S 489.

<sup>11</sup> A *lĕx sacrāta* is a law whose contravention makes the transgressor *sacer*, an outlaw.

*inuo*[l]ā[sit] (f)ūrta moriātur, et PAVLĀTŌRIAM quicumque [illam] *inuolās*it et ipse <moriāto> mo[ri]ātur. quicumqu(e) illam *inuolās*it et VĒRTOGŦ dē (h)ospitiō uel uissaciō, quicumque illam *inuolās*it, ā dē <u>ō mori(ā)tur. (*Britannia* 1993, 24: 312.)

In the name of Camulorix and Titocuna I have dedicated in the temple of the god the mule (?) which they have lost. Whoever *stole* that mule (?), whatever his name, may he let his blood until the day he die. Whoever *stole* the objects of theft, may he die; and the (), whoever *stole* it, may he die also. Whoever *stole* it and the () from the house or the pair of bags (?), whoever *stole* it, may he die by the god. (transl. Hassall and Tomlin)

In this curse tablet, the sigmatic form *inuolās*it is used as a past tense. This shows how certain ritualistic structures were preserved even when their meaning was no longer clear, at least at this educational level. The normal past tense employed in such tablets is *inuolāuit*; Tomlin (1988: 263) for example notes that it occurs thirteen times in the curse tablets from Bath which he discusses, although of course not all of the tokens are equally legible.

### Sigmatic Subjunctives of *audēre*

Sigmatic subjunctives of *audēre* were discussed in Ch. 7. They are frequent in Archaic Latin: Plautus has ten and Terence has two, as opposed to ten and six regular forms, respectively. They do not belong to a higher register. In Classical Latin and the post-classical language, they have interesting patterns of distribution in poetry and prose, as can be seen from Table 12.1.

A clear pattern emerges. In poetry, the sigmatic forms of *audēre* are not subject to any restrictions concerning person or number. The

TABLE 12.1. The sigmatic subjunctives of *audēre* in poetry and prose

|        | 1st pers. sg. <i>ausim</i> | 2nd/3rd pers. sg./pl. ( <i>ausīs</i> etc.) | Total |
|--------|----------------------------|--|-------|
| Poetry | 27                         | 21   | 48    |
| Prose  | 46                         | 2  | 48    |
| Total  | 73                         | 23   | 96    |

first person singular is more frequent than the remaining forms,<sup>12</sup> but even so we find twenty-one tokens of these forms belonging to persons other than the first.<sup>13</sup> In prose, on the other hand, the first person singular occurs forty-six times, while other forms can only be seen twice, once in a speech in Liu. 5. 3. 10 and once in Mela 1. 74.<sup>14</sup> The likelihood that this difference between prose and verse is statistically significant is higher than 99.95%, as a t-test shows. Here we can witness the beginning of a morphological restriction to the first person singular. In prose it is more or less complete, while in poetry, which is often more conservative, the other forms are still used:

(5) (Hannibal is becoming bolder and bolder.)

Nunc Hannibal ipsi  
(tam laetus bellō est) *ausit* certāre Tonantī. (Sil. 10. 53–4.)

Now Hannibal *would dare* to fight against the Thunderer himself, so much does he exult in war.

Such a usage is not possible in prose. A similar restriction process, which, however, was completed before our first literary texts, took place in the case of main clause *faxō*. *Faxō* was limited to the first person singular because it was mainly employed in promises and threats, which are prototypically in the first person singular.<sup>15</sup> *Ausim*

<sup>12</sup> In poetry it occurs in Lucr. 2. 178, 5. 196; Verg. *catal.* 9. 56, *ecl.* 3. 32, *georg.* 2. 289; Hor. *sat.* 1. 10. 48; Prop. 2. 5. 24, 2. 19. 21; Tib. 3. 7. 193 (= Paneg. in Mess.); Ou. *am.* 2. 4. 1, 2. 16. 21, *met.* 6. 561, 8. 77, *Pont.* 1. 10. 15, 4. 11. 11, 4. 12. 15, 4. 16. 41, *rem.* 700, *trist.* 1. 11. 41; Gratt. 516; Pers. 5. 26; Val. Fl. 6. 625; Stat. *Ach.* 1. 940, *Theb.* 1. 18, 3. 165; Prud. *c. Symm.* 1. 646, *ham.* 80.

<sup>13</sup> The other forms in poetry can be seen in Lucr. 2. 982, 4. 508, 5. 730, 6. 412; Catull. 61. 65, 70, 75 (always in the same phrase), 66. 28; Ou. *ars* 2. 601, *met.* 6. 466; Gratt. 531; Sil. 7. 451, 10. 54, 596, 15. 9; Stat. *Ach.* 1. 544, *Theb.* 11. 126, 12. 101; Prud. *ham.* 47, *perist.* 5. 414; Ausan. *fab.* 39. 15.

<sup>14</sup> The forty-six instances of *ausim* in prose are distributed as follows: Cic. *Brut.* 18; Rhet. *Her.* 4. 3. 5, 4. 30. 41; Liu. *pr.* 1. 3. 23. 7, 6. 40. 5, 7. 13. 6, 23. 16. 15, 28. 43. 3, 37. 53. 20, 37. 53. 25; Plin. *nat.* 17. 267; Colum. 11. 2. 82; Quint. *decl.* 247. 10, 302. 5, *inst.* 2. 5. 14, 6. 3. 11, 7. 4. 28, 9. 2. 1; Ps. Quint. *decl.* 9. 18; Tac. *agr.* 43. 2, *ann.* 1. 81. 1, *dial.* 8. 1, *hist.* 2. 50. 2, 3. 22. 2; Plin. *epist.* 4. 4. 3, 9. 13. 25; Aur. Fronto pp. 26. 8, 62. 6; Fronto pp. 118. 22, 168. 9, 168. 19; Min. Fel. 7. 1; Ps. Mar. Victorin. *gramm.* vi. 46. 20, 74. 6, 74. 10, 160. 5, 173. 22; Fortun. *rhet.* 3. 7; Amm. 21. 13. 12; Symm. *epist.* 2. 8. 1; Macr. *exc. gramm.* v. 617. 10, *Sat.* 3. 17. 11, 5. 1. 4; Scaeu. *dig.* 29. 7. 14. pr; Vlp. *dig.* 38. 16. 1. 1.

<sup>15</sup> See Vet (1990: 128–9) for examples of other expression types that prefer the 1st pers. sg. or are restricted to it.

was restricted to the first person singular because it functions as a 'hedge', more specifically, as a 'weakener'.<sup>16</sup> Here a first-person bias is natural.

Another restriction which affects prose, but not poetry, concerns the infinitives which depend on *ausim*. In poetry, any infinitive can go with *ausim*, for example *frūstrārī* or *perrumpere*. In prose, on the other hand, *ausim* is normally combined with verbs of speech, most frequently *dīcere*.<sup>17</sup> This means that in prose, *ausim* is basically limited to certain phrases; it is used in order to tone down statements, and in this function it survives for a long time. In the fourth century AD, Consult(i)us Fortunatianus still recommends its use as a 'weakener':

(6) (Metaphors should not be too daring.)

In trāslātiōne quid opseruandum est? Vt nōn longē sūmātur; sī quāndō audentius uerbum aliquod trānsferēmus, nē omnīnō praeceps abruptumque uideātur. Quem ad modum id pōnēmus? Aliquō uerēcundiōre amminiculō fulciēmus, ut inserāmus 'paene' aut 'quōdammodō' aut 'prope dīxerim' aut '*ausim* dīcere' et tālia. (Fortun. *rhet.* 3. 7.)

What do we have to observe when it comes to metaphor? That it is not far-fetched; if at some time we do use some word more daringly in a metaphorical sense, that it does not seem sudden and abrupt at all. How shall we put it? We shall support it with some more modest prop, so that we insert 'almost', or 'in some way', or 'I might almost say', or 'I *should dare* to say', and such like.

## The Remaining Sigmatic Subjunctives

If we exclude the sigmatic subjunctives of *audēre*, Plautus has forty-four sigmatic subjunctives of *facere* and fifty-two of other verbs. In Ch. 7 I argued that the proportion of sigmatic forms of *facere* was

<sup>16</sup> Watts (2003: 183) calls such items 'committers' and defines them as elements that 'lower the degree to which the speaker commits her/himself to the propositional content of the utterance'. For the concept of hedges in general see Brown and Levinson (1987: 145–72).

<sup>17</sup> There are not many exceptions: *non... ausim... insimulāre* 'I should not dare to bring a charge' (Liu. 28. 43. 3), *nōn ausim mē comparāre* 'I should not dare to compare myself' (Liu. 37. 53. 20), *uerba inserere nōn... ausim* 'I should not dare... to insert the words' (Plin. *nat.* 17. 267), *dēmere fidem nōn ausim* 'I should not dare to take away the trust' (Tac. *hist.* 2. 50. 2); should *nec ausim in utramuīs partem tālis sententiae auctor uidērī*, 'I should not dare to appear as someone who has the authority to make such a statement about either side' be considered an exception (Macr. *Sat.* 5. 1. 4)?

so high because *facere* itself is such a frequent verb. This is also the reason why we expect it to be mainly forms of *facere* which survive. The loss of forms not belonging to *facere* can already be observed in Terence: there are twelve relevant subjunctives; eight of them belong to *facere*, two to *audēre*, and one each to *appellāre* and *excēdere*.

This pattern does not change much after Terence. If we leave aside the special forms of *audēre*, there are thirty sigmatic subjunctives. Twenty-three of them belong to *facere* and seven to other verbs (*acclārāssīs*, *afflixint*, *auxīs/auxītis*, *habēssit*, *mactāssint*, and *tāxīs*).

Seven forms of *facere* are in verse<sup>18</sup> and sixteen are in prose.<sup>19</sup> All the five tokens in Cicero occur in the formula *dī faxint* (Ex. 7), but we do find other collocations elsewhere (Ex. 8):

(7) (Sulla was consul twice and dictator once.)

Ūnus adhūc fuit post Rōmam conditam—dī immortalēs *faxint* nē sit alter!—  
cū rēs pūblica tōtam sē trāderet temporibus et malīs coācta domesticīs L.  
Sulla. (Cic. *Verr.* ii. 3. 81.)

There has been only one man so far after Rome was founded—*may* the immortal gods *bring it about* that there is not a second!—into whose power the state handed itself over completely, forced by the bad situation at home. That was L. Sulla.

(8) (Horace is praying to Mercury.)

Nīl amplius ōrō,

Maiā nāte, nisi ut propria haec mihi mūnera *faxīs*. (Hor. *sat.* 2. 6. 4–5.)

I do not ask for anything further, son of Maia, except that you *make* these gifts my own.

Ten of the twenty-three tokens of *facere* are in wishes with *dī* or *deus* as subject (eight in prose and two in verse). Five other tokens, among them Ex. 8, have particular deities as subjects. Thus while it is

<sup>18</sup> They are attested in *CIL* i<sup>2</sup>. 632, Hor. *sat.* 2. 3. 36 and 2. 6. 5, Pers. 1. 112, Sil. 15. 362, Prud. *perist.* 10. 107, and Claud. 26. 528.

<sup>19</sup> Cic. *Att.* 15. 29. 1, 16. 1. 6, *fam.* 14. 3. 3, *Mur.* 84, *Verr.* ii. 3. 81; Liu. 29. 27. 1; Ambros. *epist.* 36. 10 (Zelzer); Hist. Aug. *Alb.* 13. 10, *Diad.* 7. 7, *trig. tyr.* 12. 11; Mart. Cap. 7. 730; Claud. Mam. *anim. pr.* p. 20. 12, 2. 9 p. 137. 16. Besides, three tokens are in prose inscriptions: *CIL* ii. 172. 17, vi. 32329, and *RA*, 4th ser. 1908, 12/2: 494; this last inscription with *faxit* is particularly interesting because it was written so late and far away from Rome: it comes from a Christian inscription in Algeria.

likely that speakers equated *faxim* with *faciam*, it seems that they also memorized certain fixed formulae.

The remaining seven sigmatic subjunctives do not belong to *facere*. We find *mactāssint* in a canticum in Pompon. *Atell.* 137, which is probably a survival from Archaic Latin, and there is *tāxīs* in Varro *Men.* 378, which does not look as if it had been created on the spot. *Habēssit* in Cic. *leg.* 2. 19 is not attested in Archaic Latin and, being a verb of the second conjugation, could easily have been formed on the basis of *prohibēssit* (*Pseud.* 14). In Livy we find *acclārāssis* in a prayer spoken by a priest holding the head of Numa Pompilius (Liu. 1. 18. 9), and *auxītis* in a prayer by Scipio (Liu. 29. 27. 1). Since there is also a form *auxīs* in a prayer formula in *CIL* vi. 32329 (around AD 200), *auxītis* in Livy may actually be old and could have come down to him by the tradition. However, it is hard to believe that the same should be true of *acclārāssis* in the prayer by the priest. But since *acclārāre* belongs to the first conjugation, the form is not hard to create. *Afflixint* in Fronto (p. 37. 10) could well be a form that he found in Archaic Latin literature.

To sum up, the sigmatic forms of *facere* have been preserved better than those of the other verbs, which merely have seven tokens. Sigmatic forms of verbs of the first and second conjugations can probably be made up when the context demands a higher register, but third-conjugation verbs either have sigmatic forms that are old survivals, or they have no sigmatic forms at all. Even though forms of *facere* have survived relatively well, there is a tendency to use them in fixed phrases.

### Citations, Glosses, and Grammarians

In the preceding sections I argued that sigmatic forms of *facere*, *audēre*, and verbs of the first conjugation could still be understood in Classical Latin and later on without any great difficulties, but that this was not necessarily the case for other forms. This raises two questions:

1. Grammarians cite passages containing extra-paradigmatic forms, but do not always provide explanations. Is there a specific pattern? Are there forms which are never explained because

everybody knows them, and are there forms which are so difficult that they are always explained?

2. Where there are explanations, do they make sense?

In order to answer the first of these questions, it might be helpful to look at main clause *faxō* again. For stylistic reasons, it is used until very late, which implies that the form was still understood, at least by educated Romans. Thus there would not really have been any need for the grammarians to gloss it, but they do so nonetheless. Consequently the presence of glosses and explanations does not mean much. What seems more relevant is citation without glosses.

This last statement, however, has to be modified. There are cases in which a form is cited several times, sometimes with a gloss and sometimes without. Nonius, for instance, cites *faxīs* without explaining it (p. 270. 7), but elsewhere he glosses *faxim* (p. 816. 22–3). Since grammarians generally comment on one thing at a time, the absence of a gloss going with a citation from Archaic Latin does not necessarily mean that a form was understood. We can only assume that a form was clear if there are no glosses anywhere else in the grammarians.

In short, the only thing which can tell us that a form was likely to be understood is if it is cited from Archaic Latin, but not glossed anywhere. The opposite is not true: if a form is glossed, it does not follow that it was not known to educated people.

I can now try to make a prediction. Obviously, the sigmatic forms in *-āss-* and *-ēss-*, such as *impetrāssō* and *prohibēssīs*, are morphologically clearer than those belonging to verbs of the third conjugation and to verbs of the second conjugation which do not have *-ē-* in the sigmatic stem (type *noxīt* from *nocēre*). How many forms will be cited without any explanations at all? I expect that there will be more in the first category than in the second. Is this hypothesis borne out by the facts?

There are thirty-four different verbs with sigmatic forms that are cited or glossed by later writers (I ignore sigmatic infinitives and, among the indicatives and subjunctives, variations in the prefixes).<sup>20</sup> In the distribution patterns set out below it should be noted that there are some verbs which are cited only once:

<sup>20</sup> I also ignore *inuolāsit* from the British curse tablet. It is unclear where the writer got the form from, and grammarians will of course not have read his tablet.

1. Verbs with *-āss-* or *-ēss-*: 17;

always cited with explanations: *amāss-*, *cēlāss-*, *dicāss-*,  
*perpetuāss-*, *propriāss-*;

cited sometimes with explanations and sometimes without:  
*āuerruncāss-*, *excantāss-*;

always cited without explanations: *dīlapidāss-*, *fortūnāss-*,  
*lēgāss-*, *leuāss-*, *līmāss-*, *mactāss-*, *nuncupāss-*, *plōrāss-*,  
*prohibēss-*, *turpāss-*.

## 2. Other verbs with sigmatic forms: 17;

always cited with explanations: *āx-*, *baes-*, *dēlis-*, *incēns-*, *īnsex-*,  
*serps-*, *spōns-*, *suremps-*, *uls-*;

cited sometimes with explanations and sometimes without:  
*aus-*, *caps-*, *fax-*, *iuss-*, *nox-*, *rups-*, *tāx-*;

always cited without explanations: *occīs-*.

My prediction turns out to be correct. Each of the two groups contains seventeen verbs. In the second group, which is morphologically opaque, the only form that is not glossed anywhere is *occīsīt* from the Twelve Tables. It may have been understood because the Twelve Tables were such an important text that everybody knew them.<sup>21</sup> The first group, on the other hand, is morphologically simple, which makes the forms easy to recognize. Here ten verbs are not glossed at all, which is probably not just due to chance.

The second question was whether the grammarians' explanations make sense. I expect that main clause *faxō* is glossed as a simple future rather than a future perfect.<sup>22</sup> This is indeed the case.<sup>23</sup> Phocas' explanation also captures the main uses of *faxō*:

<sup>21</sup> At least some sigmatic forms were learnt at school because they occurred in school authors like Terence or Virgil; see Sen. *epist.* 58. 4–5: *Dicēbant antiqui 'sī iussō', id est 'iusserō'. . . Nōn id agō nunc hāc diligentiā ut ostendam quantum tempus apud grammaticum perdiderim*, 'The ancients used to say *sī iussō*, that is, *sī iusserō*. . . I am not discussing this now in order to show how much time I wasted with my grammar teacher.'

<sup>22</sup> Donatus sometimes cites passages containing *faxō* without explaining the form. See Don. *Ter. Ad.* 847. 1, *Eun.* 285. 1–3, *Phorm.* 1028. Similarly, *faxis* is not glossed in Eugraph. *Ter. Andr.* 753–4.

<sup>23</sup> See Seru. *Aen.* 12. 316; Explan. in Don. *gramm.* iv. 557. 20–3; Rem. Aut. *gramm. suppl.* 255. 14 and 258. 5–6.

(9) *Faxō* futūrum tempus uel, ut alii, prōmissiūum modum ostendit. (Phoc. *gramm.* v. 436. 12.)

*Faxō* displays the future tense or, as others want it, the promissive mood.

*Faxō* is particularly frequent in promises and threats.<sup>24</sup> Other grammarians claim that *faxō* has no other persons or numbers:

(10) Dīximus autem coniugātiōnem in secundā persōnā modī indicātiū temporis praesentis inuenīrī. Ergō plērumque tālis uerbōrum in coniugātiōnibus dēfectus est, ut ipsa secunda persōna, in quā requīrī solet coniugātiō, nōn extet, ut est cēdō *faxō* amābō īnfīt inquam aiō quaesō. In hīs enim omnibus nōn est secunda persōna, quae sī deest, quem ad modum in eā littera quae coniugātiōnem prōdat poterit inuenīrī? (Consent. *gramm.* v. 382. 10–16.)

But we said that the conjugation class can be found in the second person present indicative. Now frequently verbs have such a defect in their conjugations: the second person itself, in which one normally looks for the conjugation class, does not exist. Examples are *cēdō* ('give'), *faxō* ('I shall do'), *amābō* ('please'), *īnfīt* ('he begins to speak'), *inquam* ('I say'), *aiō* ('I say'), and *quaesō* ('please'). In none of them is there a second person. If it is lacking, how can one find in it the letter that tells us about the conjugation class?

Similar statements can also be found in other grammarians.<sup>25</sup> Does this betray a lack of knowledge? In Archaic Latin we do find forms like *faxis*. Other grammarians acknowledge a second person singular in addition to the first, but go no further:

(11) Sunt alia penitus anōmala, dē quibus nihil possumus dīcere, nisi quod lēctiōne dētinentur, id est eās ūsurpāre persōnās, quae tantum auctōritāte firmantur, ut sunt haec, *faxō*, *faxis*, īnfīt, inquam et reliqua. (Seru. *gramm.* iv. 437. 20–3.)

There are other verbs which are completely anomalous. We cannot say anything about them, except that they are retained by reading, that is, they take those persons which are fixed merely by the authority (sc. of literature), for example *faxō* ('I shall bring it about'), *faxis* ('you shall do'), *īnfīt* ('he begins to speak'), *inquam* ('I say'), and the rest.

<sup>24</sup> Note that Eugraph. *Ter. Ad.* 209 paraphrases a passage with *faxō* and uses *pollicētur* in his explanation.

<sup>25</sup> See Consent. *gramm.* v. 379. 10–13; Don. *gramm.* iv. 383. 16–17 and 385. 4–8; Cledon. *gramm.* v. 58. 36–59. 3 and 62. 6–8; Phoc. *gramm.* v. 437. 16–19; Pomp. *gramm.* v. 240. 25 + 32–3; Eutyct. *gramm.* v. 448. 12–22 and 485. 12–14; Ps. Asper *gramm. suppl.* 53. 7–8; Rem. Aut. *gramm. suppl.* 258. 5–6.

If the grammarians were not speaking about all of Latin, but only about their own time, they would be correct to some extent. *Faxō* still exists in literature, but the other persons have more or less died out. However, verbs like *inquam* are still used in the second and third persons in the classical period and even at the time of the grammarians themselves, and one cannot help wondering how they could have missed them.

On various occasions the grammarians are simply wrong:

(12) *Faxō faxis*: Terentius: '*faxis* prōmissa appāreant.' (Cledon. *gramm.* v. 59. 24.)

*Faxō faxis*: Terence says: 'You will take care that you make good your promises.'

The only sigmatic future in main clauses is the form *faxō*. In this passage from Terence (*Eun.* 311), the Codex Bembinus has *faxis*, which was corrected by Ioviales to the preferable *fac sis*.<sup>26</sup> The text of Terence was already corrupt in antiquity. And what one generally misses in the grammarians is remarks about *faxō* + future, which is a construction that occurs only in Archaic Latin, but is strange from a classical perspective.<sup>27</sup>

The remaining sigmatic futures in -ō are normally glossed as future perfects, see Seneca's statement that the ancients said *iussō* for *iusserō* (*epist.* 58. 4).<sup>28</sup>

The sigmatic subjunctives of *audēre* usually have potential meaning and are paraphrased as present subjunctives by Priscian (*gramm.* ii. 482. 16–22).<sup>29</sup> Since the potential subjunctive with present force can also be in the perfect tense and is close to the future tense in meaning,

<sup>26</sup> There is a similar mistake in Don. *Ter. Andr.* 753. 3, where Donatus misinterprets the indicative *faxis* as a subjunctive dependent on the following *cauē*.

<sup>27</sup> The other remarks in the grammarians are not helpful and merely show that *faxō* was still known to them. See Ter. Maur. 940–1 on the syllable structure of *faxō* and Cassiod. *gramm.* vii. 204. 22–4 on its spelling. Prob. *nom. gramm.* iv. 216. 5–7 tells us that *faxis* is a verb, not the gen. of *fax*. Don. *Ter. Phorm.* 308. 2 cites a parallel with *faxō* from Virgil.

<sup>28</sup> He is citing Verg. *Aen.* 11. 467. For similar remarks see also Seru. *Aen.* 11. 467. Paul. Fest. p. 26 says that *amāssō* equals *amāuerō*. Nonius glosses sigmatic futures twice as future perfects (pp. 215. 7–8, 272. 18–19), but once as a present indicative (p. 104. 29–30).

<sup>29</sup> See also Prob. *inst. gramm.* iv. 186. 26–7; Gloss. *Verg.* (Thilo/Hagen) p. 529. 10–11; Paul. Fest. p. 25.

Servius is right when he glosses *ausim* as *ausus sim, audēbō*.<sup>30</sup> Phocas' statement that the sigmatic forms of *audēre* are restricted to the subjunctive appears to be correct (Phoc. *gramm.* v. 436. 4–8).

The other instances of sigmatic forms that are clearly in the subjunctive are paraphrased in two ways. Some are glossed as present subjunctives,<sup>31</sup> which is correct as far as their temporal meaning is concerned, and some are paraphrased as perfect subjunctives. Glossing them as perfect subjunctives is only appropriate where the perfect subjunctive has non-past meaning, as in second-person prohibitions, but elsewhere the sigmatic subjunctives cannot really be equated with perfect subjunctives in terms of temporal reference.<sup>32</sup> In *CGL* ii. 27. 55, *baesīs* (from *baetere*) is translated as an aorist subjunctive (προσέληθης), which is very appropriate indeed if the form is in a prohibition. The notes on the scansion of *faxīs* in Max. Victorin. *gramm.* vi. 225. 20–2 and Bede (vii. 239. 25–7) merely show that these forms were still known to these authors.<sup>33</sup>

There are some sigmatic forms in the grammarians that are morphologically ambiguous between futures and subjunctives. They are always in the third person singular or plural, and there is no context or at least not enough context to determine the mood. There are five such tokens in Festus, three in glosses, and ten in Paul the Deacon.<sup>34</sup> With the exception of one gloss, the forms are paraphrased as future perfects or perfect subjunctives.<sup>35</sup> If we are dealing with sigmatic

<sup>30</sup> See also Expositio Verg. *ad georg.* 2. 289 (Thilo/Hagen) 302. 11; Don. *Ter. Eun.* 884. 1–2. Eugraph. *Ter. Eun.* 884 paraphrases *ausim* as *audeō*, which betrays a lack of understanding.

<sup>31</sup> Don. *Ter. Andr.* 760. 1–2; Eugraph. *Ter. Haut.* 187, 198, *Hec.* 102, *Phorm.* 554; Eugraph. *Ter. Phorm.* 742 paraphrases *appellāssīs* in a prohibition as *admonet ut... et nōn iam... appellet*. Sigmatic forms are also glossed as present subjunctives in Non. pp. 105. 3–4, 220. 37–40 (if *perpetuāssint* is restored correctly). *CGL* v. 34. 1 renders *noxit* as *noceat*, but also as *noxia est*.

<sup>32</sup> The sigmatic subjunctives are glossed as perfect forms in Non. pp. 264. 6–7, 812. 27–8, 816. 22–3. Only in the first of these instances is the sigmatic form in a prohibition. *Spōnsīs* in the prayer of Messalla (Fest. p. 476) is paraphrased as *spoponderīs*, which is quite inappropriate because we are dealing with a wish with future force.

<sup>33</sup> There are no remarks on sigmatic subjunctives of *facere* in Don. *Ter. Ad.* 886. 3–5, *Eun.* 903, or *Hec.* 354. 3.

<sup>34</sup> Fest. pp. 190, 254, 382 + 384, 472, 476; *CGL* v. 49. 2, 61. 9, 61. 23; and Paul. Fest. pp. 3, 25, 50, 53, 66, 95, 99, 383, 473, 477.

<sup>35</sup> *CGL* v. 61. 23 explains the sigmatic form *dērupsit* with a perfect indicative *dispersit*.

futures, the paraphrase as future perfects would be right; if we are dealing with sigmatic subjunctives, it would be more appropriate had they been glossed as present subjunctives.

While we can say that the meaning and usage of the sigmatic forms are by and large understood correctly by the grammarians, problems arise as soon as they have a try at etymology. Cicero's explanation of *capsīs* was already rejected by Quintilian:

(13) Nam ex tribus nostrae utique linguae nōn concesserim, quamuis *capsīs* Cicerō dicat compositum esse ex *cape sī uīs*. (Quint. *inst.* 1. 5. 66.)

At any rate, I should not concede it to our language that words should be made up of three words, despite the fact that Cicero says that *capsīs* (= 'you may take') consists of *cape sī uīs* ('take if you wish').

Even if such an etymology worked morphologically and phonologically, it would still ignore the way in which the forms are used: *capsīs* is a subjunctive, not an imperative, and it is not used in commands, but frequently in prohibitions.

## RHOTACIZED FORMS AND SIGMATIC INFINITIVES

The extra-paradigmatic rhotacized forms in Archaic Latin and in later periods were discussed at the end of Ch. 7. They belong to three verbs, (*ad-*)*iuuāre* (*adiūuerō*), *monēre* (*monērīnt*), and *sinere* (*sīrīs*). They function like the sigmatic forms: the indicatives are like future perfects and the subjunctives have non-past reference. The extra-paradigmatic forms of *monēre* died out before the classical period, while those of (*ad-*)*iuuāre* and *sinere* survived for some time. Since the special forms of (*ad-*)*iuuāre* and *sinere* look so similar to the regular ones, there was a certain degree of morphological and semantic confusion between them. This meant that the regular perfect subjunctives, which normally have past reference, acquired non-past meaning in special contexts like wishes (type *nē dī sīuerīnt*, regular form = *nē dī sīrīnt*, irregular form, 'may the gods not allow it' with present/future reference). This scenario seems to indicate that some collocations containing irregular forms were memorized as idioms, and when the regular and the irregular verb forms merged morphologically, the fixed meanings were transferred to the regular forms.

The sigmatic infinitives were treated in Ch. 8. They appear in grammarians and glosses, but not in real usage in the classical period: even Plautus has only six tokens belonging to three verbs, and Terence has no such forms at all.

## THE *Ī*-SUBJUNCTIVES AND THEIR CORRESPONDING INDICATIVES

In Ch. 9 we saw that there are only nine extra-paradigmatic *ī*-subjunctives in Terence; they belong to only two verbs, *dare* (*duīs*) and *perdere* (*perduint*), and eight of them occur in formulaic wishes. The indicative forms are even rarer and cannot be found in Terence at all. Given this state of affairs, can we expect any such forms at all in later periods, and if so, are they used in fixed formulae?

### The Forms Used after 100 BC

There are merely twelve tokens of relevant forms that are in real use after 100 BC, and they belong to only two verbs (*dare* and *perdere*). Cicero has four *ī*-subjunctives (*duint* and *perduint*, twice each), all of them in formulaic wishes. Three of them occur in his speeches (*Catil.* 1. 22, *Deiot.* 21, and *Phil.* 10. 13), and one is in *Att.* 15. 4. 3. Livy has two forms, both in solemn and archaic formulae. One is the subjunctive *duit* used as a command or wish (*Liu.* 22. 10. 3), while the other seems to be an indicative and to function as a future perfect:

(14) (Appius is praying during a battle.)

Bellōna, sī hodiē nōbīs uictōriam *duis*, ast<sup>36</sup> egō tibī templum uoueō.  
(*Liu.* 10. 19. 17.)

Bellona, if you *will have given* us victory today, then I vow you a temple (= I vow that you will have a temple, if you *will have given* us victory).

Here *duis* could be a future perfect, but it is also possible to interpret the token as a present subjunctive. In Apuleius we find three relevant

<sup>36</sup> *Ast* introduces second, more specific protases in Archaic Latin; Livy's use in the apodosis is without parallels and should be regarded as a false archaism.

subjunctives (*duint* in *apol.* 64 and *perduint* in *apol.* 75 and *met.* 9. 21), all in wishes with divine subjects. M. Aurelius uses *duint* once in a wish in a letter to Fronto (Aur. Fronto p. 61. 1). The only clear instance of an *ī*-subjunctive in a subordinate clause is in Tacitus:

(15) (Tiberius addresses the senate.)

Proinde sociōs ciuēs et deōs ipsōs precor, hōs ut mihī ad finem ūsque uītāe quiētā et intellegentem hūmānī diuinīque iūris mentem *duint*, illōs ut, quandōque concesserō, cum laude et bonīs recordātiōnibus facta atque fāmam nōminis mēi prōsequantur. (Tac. *ann.* 4. 38. 3.)

Therefore I ask the allies and the citizens, and also the gods themselves, the latter that they *should give* me until the end of my life a mind that is calm and understanding of human and divine right, and the former that they should, after my death, honour my deeds and the fame of my name with praise and good memories.

Here *duint* is in an *ut*-clause. In the speech we also find the archaism *fungī* + accusative.<sup>37</sup> In all these cases the *ī*-subjunctives seem to be used because the authors are striving for archaic or solemn forms to enhance the passages in question. In seven out of the eleven cases discussed or mentioned so far, the forms occur in main clause wishes with divine subjects, so there is a certain restriction to fixed formulae.

In some ways, Ex. 16 is different:

(16) (Only statements can be true or false.)

Nam quisquis dīcit ‘perge ad uillam’ uel ‘utinam pergat ad uillam’ uel ‘dīi illum *perduint*’, nōn potest arguī quod mentiātur aut crēdī quod uerum dicat. Nihil enim affirmāuit aut negāuit. (Aug. *dial.* 2.)

For anyone who says ‘go to the villa’, or ‘would that he would go to the villa’, or ‘*may* the gods *destroy* him’ cannot be accused of lying or be believed to be saying the truth. For he has not stated or denied anything.

<sup>37</sup> Martin and Woodman (1989: 191) comment that an archaism like *duint* ‘perhaps recalls the emperor’s style’. See also Syme (1958: 284) for a brief discussion of this speech and Miller (1970: 113) for Tacitus’ linguistic characterization of Tiberius in general. It is probably best to regard such elements not as coming directly from Tiberius, but as ‘stylistic touches’ (Adams 1973: 124) created by Tacitus himself. Either way, it is interesting to contrast this with Tiberius’ letter, which has the ordinary form in a formula that often contains the special one: *dīi mē deaeque peius perdant* ... *sī sciō*, ‘may the gods and goddesses destroy me in a worse way ... if I know’ (Suet. *Tib.* 67. 1).

Here Augustine<sup>38</sup> uses *diŭ illum perduint* as an example sentence to illustrate a point he is making about logic. It is highly unlikely that *perduint* was still in active usage by the time he wrote; he may well have had an old formula in mind: *di illum perduint* can be found in *Hec.* 441.

### Citations, Glosses, and Grammarians

Since the *ī*-subjunctives are so rare in the classical period, would it not be natural if the grammarians cherished them? Rarity often goes hand in hand with a lack of understanding, and we might expect the grammarians to devote much space to these forms. However, they hardly pay any attention to them or the corresponding indicatives. Varro *ling.* 7. 91 cites a passage with *interduō* from Plautus, *Non.* p. 400. 10–11 quotes one with *perduint* from Turpilius, and *Char. gramm.* 130. 26 has one with *duīs* from Pacuvius; *Fest.* p. 288 and *Paul. Fest.* p. 247 have the interesting indicatives *adduit* and *duit* in quotations of two old laws. Yet in each of these cases they are not interested in the verb forms, but in other problems.<sup>39</sup> Attempts at explaining the forms are few and far between. *Phoc. gramm.* v. 436. 4–8 claims that *duint* is defective in terms of mood, that is, it does not have indicatives beside it. *Prisc. gramm.* iii. 289. 23–290. 2 glosses Terence's *perduint* as *perdant*. *Festus* does not explain the indicative *adduit* (p. 288), which means 'he will have given in addition', but he glosses *prōduit* as *porrō dederit* (p. 254). We cannot know whether *prōduit* is supposed to be indicative or subjunctive. Apart from the indicative *duit*, which he does not gloss, *Paul. Fest.* records two relevant interpretations; he paraphrases *duis* as *dederis* (p. 58) and *addues* as *addideris* (p. 25). Again, it is unclear whether *duis* should be taken as indicative or subjunctive. Either would be possible and correct. The subjunctive *duīs* has the time reference of the present subjunctive *dēs*, but if the form is in a prohibition, *nē duīs* can be replaced by *nē dederis*

<sup>38</sup> Or Pseudo-Augustine? Several editors of Varro or the grammarians (see Funaioli 1907: 278–86) have even regarded the first chapters of this work as a Varronian fragment.

<sup>39</sup> The same is true of the jurists and Pliny the Elder, who cite extracts from the Twelve Tables and the *lex Cincia*.

because the perfect subjunctive has preserved its non-past meaning here. *Addues* is more difficult. LLF 528 thinks that the *-e-* is long and calls the form ‘artificially archaizing’ (*künstlich archaisierend*), believing *adduēs* to be equivalent to *addēs*. This would not explain the gloss in Paul the Deacon. Since such *ē*-forms do not occur anywhere where we have surrounding context, it must remain unclear whether they really existed, and if so, what they meant.

There are twenty-four relevant forms in the glosses. The one instance of *duis* is explained by *dederis* (CGL v. 567. 57); the gloss is taken almost literally from Paul the Deacon. *Duit* and *duint* occur nine times and are glossed by Greek aorist optatives<sup>40</sup> and Latin present subjunctives or perfect indicatives.<sup>41</sup> It is strange that *duit* should be paraphrased as a Latin perfect indicative. There are two possible explanations: either *dare* could form an alternative perfect *duī*, just as *concrēdere* has *concrēduī* in Cas. 479, or someone misunderstood the subjunctive *duit* and took it as a *u*-perfect indicative. In that case, *duerit* glossed as *dederit*<sup>42</sup> would be an invented form. There are also two tokens of *duunt*, which must be indicatives. They are interpreted as *dant tribuunt* (CGL iii. 508. 25) and *dant tribuant* (CGL v. 409. 51). Again, their status must remain unclear. *Duem*, *duet*, and *duent* occur eight times and are regularly paraphrased as present subjunctives, except for one instance where the gloss reads *dent* (present subjunctive) *uel imbuunt* (present indicative) (CGL v. 567. 56).<sup>43</sup> As we do not have *ē*-forms in real texts, their meaning is unclear. Sometimes the glosses go really wrong; for example, there is even one instance of *duere uincere* (CGL v. 191. 28).<sup>44</sup>

<sup>40</sup> CGL ii. 56. 35, 36.

<sup>41</sup> Present subjunctives CGL v. 191. 30, 287. 59; perfect indicatives CGL iii. 508. 24, v. 63. 13, 567. 58; both v. 287. 60, 409. 52.

<sup>42</sup> v. 452. 20, 497. 41, 567. 53.

<sup>43</sup> The other seven tokens are in CGL iii. 333. 53, 508. 26, v. 191. 27, 29, 452. 22, 567. 54, 55.

<sup>44</sup> Paul the Deacon also has *duere* once (p. 335), but says that it means *soluere*, so *duere* stands for *luere* and has nothing to do with *dare*. *Duere* for *luere* is odd: *-d-* > *-l-* is well attested in Latin, but not *-l-* > *-d-*; see LLF 155–6. For *-d-* > *-l-* cf. *dacrima* (Livius Andronicus in Paul. Fest. p. 60) > *lacrima* and *\*dengua* > *lingua* (*\*d-* is reflected in δάκρυ, German *Zähre*, English *tear*, and in German *Zunge*, English *tongue*). According to LLF 156, *-l-* > *-d-* can normally be explained differently, e.g. Pompey’s *kadamitās* (Mar. Victorin. gramm. vi. 8. 14–15) for *calamitās* because of *cadere*.

I may now summarize. The *ī*-subjunctives were already relatively unproductive in Archaic Latin, where they occurred mainly in formulae. There were hardly any corresponding indicatives. After that, the special forms of *dare* and *perdere* are used a few times in literary texts, mainly in formulae and with the intention of making the language more solemn. Sometimes, we get citations of Archaic Latin, but not always with explanations of our forms. In fact, the lack of paraphrases seems to indicate that for the most part the forms were still understood in the post-classical period, even though they had died out in the spoken language. Grammarians and glosses usually paraphrase the forms as present subjunctives and perfect subjunctives or future perfects, all of which can be justified. It is unclear whether *duit dedit* in the glosses is correct or based on a misunderstanding of an *ī*-subjunctive. *ē*-forms like *duet* may have existed because they occur not only in glossaries, but also once in Paul the Deacon. Yet *duerit* seems to be an invention of the glosses.

## THE EXTRA-PARADIGMATIC *Ā*-SUBJUNCTIVES

As I said in Ch. 10, there are only three extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctives in Terence, *attigās* (*Andr.* 789), *crēduās* (*Phorm.* 993), and *fuāt* (*Hec.* 610). Forms of *fu*-, though proportionately less frequent in Plautus than the irregular *ā*-subjunctives of *attingere*, actually have more tokens because *esse* itself is such a frequent verb. This is presumably the reason why only the forms of *fu*- survive in literary Latin, where they are employed like regular present subjunctives of *esse*, albeit in contexts where higher register is appropriate.

### The Forms Used after 100 BC

There are twenty-seven tokens of *fuam/fuat/fuant* and one of *abfuat*.<sup>45</sup> As was the case for the sigmatic subjunctives of *audere*, there are certain differences between poetry and prose (Table 12.2).

<sup>45</sup> Lucr. 4. 637; Verg. *Aen.* 10. 108; Liu. 25. 12. 6; Fronto pp. 139. 7, 180. 13; Apul. *apol.* 92. 1; Iul. Val. 3. 41, 45; Auson. 405/406 p. 238. 14, 306. 9 p. 179; Itin. *Alex.* 49;

TABLE 12.2. The usage of *fuā-* in prose and verse

|        | <i>fors fuat (an)</i> | <i>(ab-)fuā-</i> elsewhere | Total |
|--------|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------|
| Poetry | —                     | 9                          | 9     |
| Prose  | 13                    | 5                          | 18    |
| Total  | 13                    | 14                         | 27    |

This distribution is remarkable: in prose it is mainly the phrase *fors fuat (an)* that is used—it occurs in thirteen<sup>46</sup> out of the eighteen tokens in prose—while in poetry *fors fuat (an)* is not used at all.<sup>47</sup> Again, poetry has remained more flexible, while the forms in prose are being restricted to one single phrase:<sup>48</sup>

(17) (Wise men do not desire goods that depend on chance.)

*Sī mē interrogēs, concupiscamne bonam ualētūdinem, abnuam equidem, sī sim philosophus: nihil est enim fās concupiscere sapientī aut appetere, quod fors fuat an frūstrā concupiscat; nec quicquam quod in manū Fortūnae situm uideat concupiscet.* (Fronto p. 139. 5–8.)

If you were to ask me if I desired health, I for my part would say no if I were a philosopher: for it is not right for a wise man to desire or strive for something that he might *perhaps* desire in vain; he will not desire anything of which he sees that it lies in Fortuna's hands.

In this example, *fors fuat an* functions just like *forsitan* (< *fors sit an*), which is more normal in Classical Latin. *Fors fuat (an)* is a learned set phrase.

In three of the remaining tokens in prose, the forms of *fuā-* are potential subjunctives.<sup>49</sup> There is also one instance in a speech in Iulius Valerius where *fuant* is an auxiliary used to form the perfect subjunctive *ēditae fuant*. There is only one more token in prose,

Symm. *epist.* 1. 3. 5, 1. 20. 3, 1. 39. 2. 3, 3. 6. 1, 4. 28. 1, 4. 29. 1; Prud. *c. Symm.* 1. 504; Mart. Cap. (always in the verse parts) 1. 91, 3. 222, 3. 262, 4. 327; Mar. Victor *aleth.* 1. 406; Sidon. *epist.* 2. 2. 17, 8. 3. 6, 9. 7. 1.

<sup>46</sup> Seven of them are in Symmachus.

<sup>47</sup> The likelihood that this finding is statistically significant is higher than 99.95%, as can be seen from a t-test.

<sup>48</sup> *Fors fuat (an)* occurs in Fronto p. 139. 7; Apul. *apol.* 92. 1; Auson. 405/406 p. 238. 14; Symm. *epist.* 1. 3. 5, 1. 20. 3, 1. 39. 2. 3, 3. 6. 1, 4. 28. 1, 4. 29. 1; Sidon. *epist.* 2. 2. 17, 8. 3. 6, 9. 7. 1.

<sup>49</sup> Liu. 25. 12. 6; Iul. Val. 3. 41; Itin. *Alex.* 49.

namely *abfuat* in an indirect question in Fronto p. 180. 13. It is employed like *apsit*. It is unclear whether Fronto found the form in an old text or whether he formed it by analogy (*sit : fuat :: apsit : abfuat*).

While it is *fors fuat (an)* that predominates in prose, *fuat* is not employed in this phrase in the nine tokens in poetry. Lucretius has *fuat* in an *ut*-clause; Virgil uses *fuat* only once, in an indirect question:

(18) (Jupiter is speaking in the council of the gods.)

Trōs Rutulusne *fuat*, nullō discrimine habēbō. (Verg. *Aen.* 10. 108.)

Be he a Trojan or a Rutulian, I shall not make any distinction.

Here *fuat* functions like *sit* or *siet*.<sup>50</sup> It is equally rare among later poets: Ausonius has *fuat* in a prohibition, Prudentius uses *fuat* in a command, and Marius Victor(ius) employs the phrase *fās fuat* once. Only Martianus Capella in his highly affected style of writing has *fuat/fuant* more than once: he has two tokens in relative clauses and one each in a conditional clause and in an indirect question.

### Citations, Glosses, and Grammarians

Since in classical and post-classical literature the *ā*-subjunctives are so rare and restricted to the isolated forms of *fu-*, the question arises whether they were actually still understood. Sometimes grammarians and other writers cite passages of Archaic Latin containing *ā*-subjunctives without commenting on the subjunctive forms themselves.<sup>51</sup> This does of course not mean that the grammarians in question could make sense of the forms. Nonius seems to have grasped their meaning because he consistently glosses extra-paradigmatic *ā*-forms with present subjunctives.<sup>52</sup> Similarly, Paul the Deacon writes *crēduās crēdās* (Paul. Fest. p. 52), quoting *Bacch.* 476. But Seru. *Aen.*

<sup>50</sup> Note also the single *-ne* in the disjunctive indirect question, which is an archaism.

<sup>51</sup> For *attulāt* see Non. p. 369. 3–370. 6. For *fuās/fuāt* see Cens. 24. 3; Char. *gramm.* 374. 8–15; ant. *carm.* ap. Gell. 4. 9. 1; Seru. *Aen.* 1. 377. For *ēuenāt* see Non. pp. 369. 3–370. 6, 760. 10–11.

<sup>52</sup> Nonius has the following glosses: *attigat, contingat* (p. 106. 25), *ēuenat prō ēueniat* (p. 816. 19), and *fuam, sim uel fiam* (p. 159. 7).

10. 108 and Sergius (Explan. in *Don. gramm.* iv. 557. 16–17), both commenting on the same line from Virgil, claim that *fuat* is a future perfect. I cited the passage from Virgil above, in Ex. 18; since *fuat* is in an indirect question, it cannot be a future perfect, but has to be a subjunctive.

However, things go really wrong when the grammarians write about morphology rather than meaning. Diomedes, quoting Terence's *fors fuāt pol* (*Hec.* 610) and Virgil's *Trōs Rutulūse*<sup>53</sup> *fuat* (Ex. 18 above), argues that the ancients used to conjugate *fuō*, *fuās*, *fuat* (*Diom. gramm.* i. 379. 29–380. 6). This must mean that he takes *fuat* as a third person singular indicative of the first conjugation, even though he says that the infinitive is *fore* (not †*fuāre*, as one might expect from *fuō* and *fuās*). Similar statements can be found in *Sacerd. gramm.* vi. 489. 12–15 and *Prob. cath. gramm.* iv. 37. 11–13.

Concerning forms like *attigās*, Diomedes states that the correct usage is to have forms with *-n-*, but that eloquent and elegant writers like Pacuvius and Plautus sometimes used forms without *-n-*, such as *attigō*, *attigis* (*Diom. gramm.* i. 382. 14–20). Diomedes obviously does not understand the functional difference between *attigās* and *attingās*, but from a purely formal point of view he is right, especially since an indicative *tagit* is cited from a real text by Festus. This passage in Festus, however, is not entirely clear:

(19) (Festus has given examples of *tagit* and *tagam* in Pacuvius.)

Sine dubiō antīquā cōnsuētūdine ūsurpāuit. Nam nunc ea sine prae-positionibus nōn dīcuntur, ut contigit, attigit. (Fest. p. 490.)

He undoubtedly used them according to the old custom. For nowadays they are only employed with prefixes, for instance *contigit* ('it came about') and *attigit* ('he touched').

Surely Festus does not mean that the verb *tangere* does not exist in his time any more and that it has been ousted by *contingere* and *attingere*: this would be blatantly false. If so, Festus must have cited *tagit* and *tagam* not because of the verb *tangere* as such, but because of the morphological oddity of the forms, which, from a synchronic point of view, consists in the absence of the nasal infix. The only forms of *tangere* that do not have *-n-* belong to the *perfectum* stem, for example

<sup>53</sup> *-ue* is an alternative reading for *-ne*.

*tetigit*. However, *tetigit* is reduplicated, while *tagit* is not. Hence the comparison between *tagit* and the compound *contigit*, which has lost the reduplication by syncope. It is not clear whether Festus thought that *tagit* is a perfect indicative.<sup>54</sup>

Diom. *gramm.* i. 380. 19–20 cites a form *apstulās* from Plautus and claims that the present (*īnstāns*) is *apstulō*. Whether a form *apstulō* ever existed is uncertain. Unlike with *fuō* and *fuās* above, we cannot know if he regarded *apstulās* as an indicative, but it is not inconceivable that he could not construe the text and did precisely that.<sup>55</sup>

## CONCLUSIONS

The extra-paradigmatic forms are already on their way out in Archaic Latin, where the situation could best be described by the words ‘limited/semi-systematic usage’. After that, we only find sporadic survival of odd bits and pieces.

Initially I asked two questions:

1. What forms die out and what forms are retained? Do morphologically opaque forms die out before the rare forms or *vice versa*?
2. In what way do the forms die out?

Concerning the first of these questions, it seems that frequency and morphological clarity play equally important roles. Of the sigmatic forms, those belonging to *fac-e-re* (*fac-s-ō*) and *aud-ē-re* (*au-s-im*) are more difficult to derive synchronically than for example *amā-ss-ō* from *amā-re*, but on account of their high frequency they survive best. Forms in *-āss-* and *-ēss-* are simple from a morphological point of view, and Cicero in his *leg.* seems to have made up some such forms himself. In the grammarians, these forms in *-āss-* and *-ēss-* are relatively often not glossed, probably because they were still understood.

<sup>54</sup> Paul. Fest. p. 491 is merely an excerpt of the Festus passage and does not give us any new information.

<sup>55</sup> The passage in Macr. *gramm.* v. 606. 37–607. 2 is similar in content.

Forms like *āxim*, which are both rare and morphologically opaque, died out quickly.

The extra-paradigmatic rhotacized forms are special. *Monerint* simply dies out, but *sīrīs* and *iūuerint* merge with their regular counterparts, which look very similar. This merger is both morphological and semantic: morphologically, the special forms survive as doublets of the regular forms, and semantically, the regular forms can fulfil the functions of the old irregular forms.

The sigmatic infinitives died out before the end of the archaic period.

The extra-paradigmatic *ī*- and *ā*-subjunctives are all equally difficult from a morphological perspective. Here only those that are most frequent in Archaic Latin survive (*duit*, *perduit*, and *fuat*). The grammarians seem to have understood the *ī*-forms, but not always the *ā*-forms.

My second question was how the extra-paradigmatic forms died out. I found that sometimes there are differences between prose and verse; poetry tends to be more conservative. Thus the sigmatic forms of *audēre* are more or less restricted to the first person singular in prose, while in verse the other persons can still be used. Similarly, *fuat* is being restricted to the phrase *fors fuat (an)* in prose, while there is no such process going on in poetry.

The loss of the construction *faxō* + simple future, so frequent in Archaic Latin, is understandable because there are no comparable collocations in Classical Latin (or in Archaic Latin for that matter). Speakers simply got rid of a syntactic anomaly that was presumably harder to bear than a morphological peculiarity like an *-s-* in the stem.

A first step towards losing forms is the restriction to certain persons or construction types. These two processes are probably independent of each other. *Faxō* in main clauses became limited to the first person singular before our earliest literary texts, but has a number of constructions. The *s*-forms of *audēre* in prose underwent both types of restrictions: they virtually occur only in the first person singular, and normally with verbs of speech. *Ausim dicere* has a 'politeness function' because it tones down statements; it is this function which helped it to survive.

The next phase in the loss of forms is the restriction to certain formulae or phrases. This is what is happening to the irregular

subjunctives of *esse* and *dare* or *perdere*. Here we mostly get *fors fuat* (*an*) and *dī duint* or *dī perduint*.

Restriction to certain persons, construction types, or phrases presumably implies that remembering the uses of these items becomes more difficult. But it is also possible that there are processes which simplify this task. In Archaic Latin, *faxō* can take the double accusative, but, unlike *faciam*, not the simple accusative. In Classical Latin, *faxō* once takes the simple accusative: we find *ego foedera faxō* 'I shall make treaties' in Verg. *Aen.* 12. 316. This is probably the result of equating *faxō* with *faciam* completely. Such a change could be argued to be a simplification: previously, speakers had to memorize three future tenses, *faciam*, *fēcerō*, and *faxō*, all of them with different constructions. Now there are only two future tenses, *faciam* with an alternative form *faxō*, and *fēcerō*.

## Part IV

### A Brief Summary of the Results

*This page intentionally left blank*

## Summary

As we saw at the start, Seneca pointed out that the ancients used *iussō* instead of *iusserō*. The fact that Latin had changed over the centuries was obvious to the educated Roman, and later writers like Fronto or Apuleius were much given to archaizing their language deliberately by adding such obsolete words.

Language change is particularly visible in verbal morphology and morphosyntax. The classical system is marked by great regularity, perhaps even rigidity. Once learners have mastered a few paradigms, they can, if they know merely four principal parts of a verb, form all its tenses and moods. The verbal system of Archaic Latin, by contrast, is full not only of doublets like *audiam/audibō*, but also of forms that cannot easily be assigned to any one tense or aspect category, such as *iussō* above. The latter had never been discussed extensively and in their entirety and so formed the main object of this study. I classified them into three groups. The sigmatic forms like *faxō* or *impetrāssō* are characterized by -s- or -ss-; this group has the greatest number of tokens and also of verbs. There are sigmatic indicatives (*faxō/impetrāssō*), subjunctives (*faxim/impetrāssim*), and infinitives (*impetrāssere*). The second group comprises *ī*-subjunctives of *dare* and its compounds, for example *duim* and *perduint*. It only contains a few indicative forms such as *duit*. The third group is also more or less restricted to subjunctives: in it there are those subjunctives which have the modal marker -ā-, but which do not belong to the present stem. Examples are *fuās* and *attigās*.

The meaning and usage of particular verb forms cannot be described in isolation; meaning and usage are best discussed by looking at contrasts with other forms. Thus in order to see how the

extra-paradigmatic forms are employed in Archaic Latin, it is essential to have a clear understanding of how the regular forms function. The main question is to what extent classical and archaic usage are the same. Here most of the secondary literature tends to over-emphasize or neglect the differences between the two, neither of which approaches helps to give us an accurate picture of the actual situation. I examined four specific problems. A solution to them is vital for drawing a comparison between the regular and the extra-paradigmatic forms. In Ch. 2, I discussed what constitutes the contrast between simple future and future perfect in Archaic Latin; this was a preliminary to Ch. 6, where I looked at sigmatic futures. I adopted a practical, corpus-based approach. This led to some interesting results which differed markedly from those found in much of the earlier work on the topic: I claimed that the variation between simple future and future perfect is neither random nor purely aspectual. I argued that the difference between the two tenses is that the future perfect marks events as anterior and concluded. This cannot be said of the simple future. Thus we need both relative tense (anteriority) and aspect (conclusion) to account for the distinction between the two tenses. In main clauses, the future perfect of *uidēre* does not normally express anteriority or conclusion. This is a remnant of an earlier aspectual system, where the difference between simple future and future perfect had to do with imperfective and perfective aspect rather than with temporal distinctions and conclusion.

I then turned to the sequence of tenses in Archaic Latin, restricting myself to the use of subjunctives (Ch. 3); the sequence rules for subjunctives mattered because they helped me with the meaning of extra-paradigmatic subjunctives in subordinate clauses (Chs. 7, 9, and 10). My main finding was that the sequence rules of Archaic and Classical Latin are for the most part the same, despite what some of the standard manuals say. The similarities and differences can be accounted for relatively easily by recourse to a few semantic principles. One major difference is that the expression of posteriority with the *-ūrus* forms is still rare in Archaic Latin, while it is regular in classical *quīn*-clauses and indirect questions. Instead of these periphrastic forms, Archaic Latin mostly employs the present and imperfect subjunctives. The other difference is that secondary sequence ('backshift of tenses')

is not yet obligatory after past verbs in Archaic Latin. However, lack of backshift is very rare even then.

In Ch. 4 I tried to define the difference between the use of prohibitive *nē faciās* (present subjunctive) and that of *nē fēcerīs* (perfect subjunctive); again, the results were useful for my work on extra-paradigmatic subjunctives (Chs. 7, 9, and 10). It is often claimed that there are aspectual or stylistic differences. My material did not allow me to detect distinctions in time reference (near future versus distant future), ‘aspect’ (inhibitive versus preventive), register, or politeness. There is, however, a clear difference in persons: the prohibitive perfect subjunctive is virtually restricted to the second person, while the prohibitive present subjunctive is used for both the second person and the third. It is unclear why speakers maintained this pattern and why they did not create *nē fēcerit* or abolish either *nē faciās* or *nē fēcerīs*. I did not venture an explanation. The origins of the pattern present fewer difficulties. The non-past perfect subjunctive in *nē fēcerīs* continues an old aorist usage. Since perfect subjunctives acquired past or anterior meaning in the history of Latin, this old use became an anomaly and was restricted to the prototypical directives, that is, those in the second person. For the third person, the present subjunctive is used, which has non-past reference and fits well into the synchronic system. *Nē faciās* looks like an attempt to regularize the system.

I dedicated Ch. 5 to the problem of the AcIs with future force; this is the context in which most of the sigmatic infinitives (Ch. 8) appear. I discovered some surprising patterns which had gone unnoticed in earlier investigations, most of which either claimed that no patterns could be discerned or focused on the superordinate verbs, a factor that turns out to be irrelevant on closer inspection. In Classical Latin the future infinitive has to be used if there is future reference, while Archaic Latin also employs the present infinitive. Since the future infinitive is an innovation, the use of the present for the future is an archaism. I demonstrated that in Archaic Latin this usage is already on its way out and is restricted to telic AcIs. Even here it is only frequent if the subject of the infinitive is identical with that of the superordinate verb. This means that syntactic change affecting tense and aspect is sensitive to factors like telicity and identity of subjects, neither of which is marked morphologically.

The conclusion for Chs. 2–5 must be that the regular forms, that is, those which are the standard forms of Classical Latin, are by and large employed in the same way in Archaic Latin as in the classical language. This is especially clear in the use of the future tenses and in the sequence rules. In prohibitions and in ACIs with future force, the speaker of Archaic Latin had more freedom than the speaker of Classical Latin. He could use *nē faciās* instead of *nē fēcerīs* and sometimes also present infinitives instead of future ones. However, the similarities are greater than the differences even here. The regular forms certainly do not allow us to argue that the system of Archaic Latin is very different from that of Classical Latin. But how do the extra-paradigmatic forms fit in?

My discussion of extra-paradigmatic forms provides their first comprehensive treatment and contains a number of new and surprising findings. I looked at the sigmatic forms in Chs. 6–8. The sigmatic indicatives, which I discussed in Ch. 6, have remarkable distributional properties: in subordinate clauses, many different verbs in all persons and numbers are used, while the only form in main clauses is the isolated *faxō*. Main clause *faxō* functions as a causative in most instances, but has partly been reanalysed as a marker of certainty, in which case it may actually have been deverbilized in some instances. Similar cases of grammaticalization can be found in a number of unrelated languages. Where *faxō* is verbal, it is a perfective future. It does not indicate anteriority and is relatively close to the simple future in meaning. Main clause *faxō* does not belong to any particular register. In subordinate clauses, on the other hand, the sigmatic futures function like regular future perfects. Their predominance in conditional clauses has to do with the fact that the forms are dying out and that they were preserved better in conditional clauses because that was where speakers encountered them most often: they are frequent in legal language, which is rich in conditional clauses. The forms in subordinate clauses belong to a higher register, which is not unusual for forms that are on their way out.

There are a few sigmatic infinitives that are derivatives of verbs belonging to first conjugation (type *impetrāssere*, see Ch. 8). They belong to an elevated register. My main results, however, were negative: I showed that these forms are so rare that it is impossible to tell with certainty whether they function like future infinitives proper

(*impetrātūrum esse*) or like present infinitives (*impetrāre*), which can have future reference as well. The strength of some scholars' opinions on this matter is entirely unjustifiable.

In Chs. 7, 9, and 10 I looked at extra-paradigmatic subjunctives. Ch. 7 was devoted to the sigmatic subjunctives, Ch. 9 to the type *duīs*, and Ch. 10 to the type *attigās*. All three have much in common, a fact which was overlooked in most of the earlier literature. Compared with their regular counterparts, the forms are more productive in main clauses than in subordinate ones. I claimed that this is connected with their status as obsolescent forms. In main clauses, the choice between indicative and subjunctive is meaningful because it goes hand in hand with different interpretations of the clauses. The indicative is used for example in factual statements, while the subjunctive can be found in wishes, prohibitions, or potential and unreal statements. In subordinate clauses, on the other hand, there is often no choice because a number of subordinators demand the subjunctive. Here the mood cannot contribute much to the meaning of the clause. If a form is dying out, its use is a conscious decision, and so it will be found more frequently in contexts where it fulfils some real function.<sup>1</sup> The decrease in frequency and productivity is associated with higher register.

The time reference of these subjunctives has always been a moot point. I demonstrated that all extra-paradigmatic subjunctives have non-past reference. They share this time reference with the present subjunctives, but also with some perfect subjunctives; while the perfect subjunctive normally has past reference, it has kept its original non-past meaning in two contexts, prohibitions and potential statements. Thus the extra-paradigmatic subjunctives could either function like regular present subjunctives or oscillate in meaning between regular present subjunctives and non-past perfect subjunctives. In order to find out if one could decide for one of these possibilities, I analysed the way in which the forms are distributed over the various

<sup>1</sup> The sigmatic indicatives apart from *faxō* are restricted to subordinate clauses. At first sight, this seems to contradict the statement I have just made, namely that the sigmatic subjunctives are more frequent in main clauses because they are dying out. However, the restriction of the sigmatic futures is easy to understand if we consider that these forms are future anteriors; future anteriors are more typical of subordinate than of main clauses.

clause types. All three types of extra-paradigmatic subjunctives have the same peculiarities in their distribution, and this was one of my major findings: they are disproportionately frequent in prohibitions and subordinate *nē*-clauses, but very rare in commands and subordinate *ut*-clauses. Present subjunctives are frequent in both commands and *ut*-clauses, but perfect subjunctives with non-past meaning are, like the extra-paradigmatic subjunctives, absent from commands. Moreover, the extra-paradigmatic subjunctives have another oddity in common with the perfect subjunctives in prohibitions: they are almost exclusively used in the second person, whereas the present subjunctives in prohibitions are more frequent in the third person than in the second. For these reasons, I concluded that all three types of extra-paradigmatic subjunctives are old *perfectum* subjunctives. Unlike the regular perfect subjunctives, they never have past meaning. The past meaning of the regular perfect subjunctives is an innovation that arose by association with the perfect indicatives, which had always had past meaning in pre-Latin. The extra-paradigmatic subjunctives failed to acquire past meaning because they had no past indicatives beside them.

The extra-paradigmatic forms in Archaic Latin are not frequent enough to warrant claims that the verbal system of Archaic Latin differs in essential points from that of Classical Latin. However, they do allow us some glimpses on what was going on in the stages before our earliest texts. In other words, these forms show that synchronic analyses can afford us some help in reconstruction.

In Part III of this book, I tried to tackle not only problems of reconstruction, but also diachronic questions of a different nature: what forms survived in literary Latin, and are the survivals random, or are there any recognizable patterns? I started with reconstruction (Ch. 11). Here I showed the importance of synchronic semantics for diachronic morphological studies. Instead of advancing any new hypotheses, I tested the old ones in the light of my own findings and showed which ones were compatible with my synchronic results. The main problem concerning the origin of the sigmatic forms is whether they go back to aorists or desideratives. The question cannot be answered on a purely morphological basis. We also have to look at meaning. The simple future meaning of main clause *faxō* is not difficult to explain, whether we derive *faxō* from an aorist subjunctive

or from a desiderative. However, the future perfect meaning of the sigmatic futures in subordinate clauses is more easily explained if we assume that the forms go back to old aorists rather than to desideratives. The peculiar patterns of distribution of the sigmatic subjunctives point in the same direction: they are old *perfectum* subjunctives. The Latin *perfectum* stem arose from Proto-Italic aorist and perfect stems, but not from desideratives. Thus the sigmatic forms can most easily be associated with old *s*-aorists. For *faxō* itself, however, we cannot reconstruct an *s*-aorist for Proto-Italic or Indo-European. The sigmatic formation, though going back to aorists, gained a certain degree of independence in the subjunctive (> future) and the optative (> subjunctive) and spread to roots which did not have sigmatic aorists originally.

The geminated *-ss-* in forms like *amāssō* is a problem, whether we derive the forms from aorists or from desideratives. Perhaps the simplest way of getting the *-ss-* is by assuming (with *LLF*) that the forms were created by analogy: *dixem* : *dixim* :: *amāsem* : *amāssim*.

There are two problems concerning the type *duim*: where does the *-u-* come from and why does the present *dem* not have reduplication like its Italic counterparts? The *-u-* cannot be derived by the standard phonological developments and arose in Italic, although it remains unclear where it comes from. The lack of reduplication in *dem* is problematic because it is typical of aorist forms; since I argued that *duim* continues an aorist optative, I had to explain the functional differences between *dem* and *duim*. It seems that the present stem forms of *dare* were built on modal forms of aorists, perhaps the aorist imperatives, after they were reanalysed as presents. Consequently *dem* had present meaning from the beginning, while *duim* remained an aoristic form.

As early as Terence, the extra-paradigmatic formations had lost their productivity. In Ch. 12 I asked two questions which had never been addressed in the literature: what remains of the extra-paradigmatic forms in Classical and Post-Classical Latin, and are there any patterns as to what survives longest? This has repercussions mainly for our understanding of how lexical items are remembered, but to a lesser extent looking at the loss of forms in a 'healthy' language could help us to see what happens when a language dies. Perhaps my most important, though by no means unexpected,

finding was that poetry often retains archaic patterns which have already been lost in prose. Thus *fuat* in prose clearly predominates in the fixed phrase *fors fuat an*, while it is not used in this way in verse, which preserves more constructions. The extra-paradigmatic *ā*-subjunctives of other verbs do not survive in Classical Latin. Of the sigmatic forms of *audēre*, it is virtually only *ausim* that occurs in prose, again mainly in fixed phrases, while we also find *ausīs* and other persons in verse. *Ausim dicere* in prose tones down statements the speaker is making, and this politeness function furthered the survival of the first person form. The form *faxō* remains as an archaism in verse and in Apuleius, but the construction type *faxō* + future, which has no parallels in Classical Latin, is lost. Cicero is still able to create his own forms in *-āss-* and *-ēss-* when he writes 'legalese' in *leg*. Among the forms cited by the grammarians without any glosses, those in *-āss-* and in *-ēss-* are most frequent because they are morphologically less opaque than other sigmatic forms. Extra-paradigmatic *ī*-subjunctives are only formed from two verbs, *dare* and *perdere*, and they are mainly restricted to formulaic wishes.

There is one last question that had to wait until now, after all my analyses. If the future *faxō* and the subjunctives *amāssīs*, *duīs*, and *aduenās* continue subjunctives and optatives of aorists or aorist-like formations, why are there no corresponding indicatives? Since *aduenās* is inherited, it is likely to have had an indicative beside it, which then died out. Why did *aduenās* remain? *Faxō* and *faxim* are innovations. Why was no *†faxī* created? If indicatives are less marked than subjunctives and optatives, which is a common assumption, such a pattern must come as a surprise. I can only speculate why the indicatives died out or were not even created. It is possible that the syncretism of perfect and aorist indicative into a new past tense preceded the syncretism of perfect and aorist subjunctive and optative. In that case, there would still have been a semantic contrast between perfect and aorist in the subjunctive and optative when this contrast had been given up in the indicative. This would explain why *duīs* and *aduēnās* survive alongside old perfect forms like *dederīs* and *aduēnerīs*, and why new aorist-like formations like *faxō* could be created next to the old aorist *fēcī*, which no longer had a function that was different from that of old perfects like *dedī*.

This leads me to the end of this book. I have not been able to solve every single problem associated with the extra-paradigmatic verb forms, let alone with the regular ones. Many more volumes would be required for this, but probably my book is already long enough to abuse my readers' patience. Nevertheless, I hope they will not agree with Seneca and believe that grammar is a waste of time.

## References

These references are not intended as a complete bibliography on the subject. They merely contain the works cited in this book. Journals are abbreviated in accordance with the norms set out in the *Année Philologique* and the *Bibliographie Linguistique*. I have quoted Latin and Greek authors from the standard editions in the Oxford and Teubner series; these works are not listed here.

- ADAMS, J. N. (1972), 'The Language of the Later Books of Tacitus' *Annals*, CQ, NS 22: 350–73.
- (1973), 'The Vocabulary of the Speeches in Tacitus' Historical Works', BICS 20: 124–44.
- (1977), *The Vulgar Latin of the Letters of Claudius Terentianus* (P. Mich. VIII, 467–72) (Manchester).
- (1982), *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* (London).
- (1984), 'Female Speech in Latin Comedy', *Antichthon* 18: 43–77.
- (1990), 'The Latinity of C. Novius Eunus', *ZPE* 82: 227–47.
- (1995a), *Pelagonius and Latin Veterinary Terminology in the Roman Empire* (Leiden, New York, and Cologne).
- (1995b), 'The Language of the Vindolanda Writing Tablets: An Interim Report', *JRS* 85: 86–134.
- (2003a), *Bilingualism and the Latin Language* (Cambridge).
- (2003b), 'The New Vindolanda Writing-Tablets', CQ, NS 53: 530–75.
- LAPIDGE, M., and REINHARDT, T. (2005), 'Introduction', in Reinhardt, Lapidge, and Adams (2005), 1–36.
- and MAYER, R. G. (eds.) (1999a), *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry* (Oxford).
- and MAYER, R. G. (1999b), 'Introduction', in Adams and Mayer (1999a), 1–18.
- ALLARDICE, J. T. (1929), *Syntax of Terence* (Oxford).
- AMMANN, H. (1927), 'Die ältesten Formen des Prohibitivsatzes im Griechischen und Lateinischen', *IF* 45: 328–44.
- ARONOFF, M. (1994), *Morphology by Itself: Stems and Inflectional Classes* (Cambridge, Mass., and London).
- ASHMORE, S. G. (ed.) (1908), *P. Terenti Afri Comoediae: The Comedies of Terence, Edited with Introduction and Notes* (New York).

- BACK, M. (1991), 'Das Verhältnis von Aktionsarten und Tempus im Idg.', *HSF* 104: 279–302.
- BAGORDO, A. (forthcoming), 'Langversstil und Senarstil bei Terenz', in P. Kruschwitz, W.-W. Ehlers, and F. Felgentreu (eds.), *Terentius poeta* (Munich).
- BAMMESBERGER, A. (1982), 'The Origin of the  $\bar{a}$ -Subjunctive in Irish', *Ériu* 33: 65–72.
- (1984), 'Zum Konjunktiv des Präsens bei lat. *dare*', *Glotta* 62: 75–80.
- BARSBY, J. (ed.) (2001), *Terence*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., and London).
- BEELER, M. S. (1956), 'Venetic and Italic', in *Hommages à Max Niedermann* (Brussels), 38–48.
- BENNETT, C. E. (1910), *Syntax of Early Latin*, i: *The Verb* (Boston).
- BENVENISTE, É. (1922), 'Les Futurs et subjunctifs sigmatiques du latin archaïque', *BSL* 23: 32–63.
- BERTOCCI, D. (2001), 'Il latino arcaico e l'evoluzione del sistema verbale: osservazioni sulle forme del tipo *faxo/faxim*', in M. Mariani and R. Ronzitti (eds.), *Ricerche di linguistica diacronica, prospettica e retrospettiva* (Alessandria), 92–104.
- BLASE, H. (1898), 'Zur Geschichte der Futura und des Konjunktivs des Perfekts im Lateinischen', *ALL* 10: 313–43.
- (1919), 'Zum Konjunktiv im Lateinischen: 1. Der Jussivus des Plusquamperfekts', *Glotta* 10: 30–8.
- BLÜMEL, W. (1979), 'Zur historischen Morphosyntax der Verbalabstrakta im Lateinischen', *Glotta* 57: 77–125.
- BOLKESTEIN, A. M. (1976), 'The Relation between Form and Meaning of Latin Subordinate Clauses Governed by *verba dicendi*', *Mnemosyne* 29: 155–75, 268–300.
- (1979), 'Subject-to-Object Raising in Latin?', *Lingua* 48: 15–34.
- (1980), *Problems in the Description of Modal Verbs: An Investigation of Latin* (Assen).
- BOLKESTEIN, A. M., KROON, C. H. M., PINKSTER, H., REMMELINK, H. W., and RISSELADA, R. (eds.) (2002), *Theory and Description in Latin Linguistics: Selected Papers from the XIth International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics, Amsterdam, June 24–29, 2001* (Amsterdam).
- BROWN, G., and YULE, G. (1983), *Discourse Analysis* (Cambridge).
- BROWN, P., and LEVINSON, S. C. (1987), *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*, 2nd edn. (Cambridge).
- BUCK, C. D. (1928), *A Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian: With a Collection of Inscriptions and a Glossary*, 2nd edn. (Boston).
- BYBEE, J. L., PAGLIUCA, W., and PERKINS, R. D. (1994), *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World* (Chicago and London).

- CAMPBELL, L., and MUNTZEL, M. C. (1989), 'The Structural Consequences of Language Death', in N. C. Dorian (ed.), *Investigating Obsolescence: Studies in Language Contraction and Death* (Cambridge), 181–96.
- CANNEGIETER, H. (1896), *De formis, quae dicuntur futuri exacti et conjunctivi perfecti formae syncopatae in -so -sim* (diss., Utrecht).
- CHRISTENSON, D. M. (ed.) (2000), *Plautus: Amphitruo* (Cambridge).
- COLEMAN, R. (1975), 'Greek Influence on Latin Syntax', *TPhS* 73: 101–56.
- (1985a), 'The Indo-European Origins and Latin Development of the Accusative with Infinitive Construction', in C. Touratier (ed.), *Syntaxe et latin: Actes du I I<sup>ème</sup> congrès international de linguistique latine, Aix-en-Provence, 28–31 Mars 1983* (Aix-en-Provence), 307–41.
- (1985b), 'The Latin Future Passive Infinitive', *Glotta* 63: 208–12.
- (1999), 'Poetic Diction, Poetic Discourse and the Poetic Register', in Adams and Mayer (1999a), 21–93.
- COLLART, J. (ed.) (1962), *T. Maccius Plautus Curculio: Plaute Charançon; édition, introduction et commentaire* (Paris).
- COMRIE, B. (1976), *Aspect: An Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems* (Cambridge).
- (1985), *Tense* (Cambridge).
- COWGILL, W. C. (1960), 'Evidence for Laryngeals in Greek', in W. Winter (ed.), *Evidence for Laryngeals: Work Papers of a Conference in Indo-European Linguistics on May 7 and 8, 1959* (Austin, Tex.), 93–162.
- (1964), 'The Supposed Cypriote Optatives *duwánoi* and *dókoι*: With Notes on the Greek Infinitive Formation', *Language* 40: 344–65.
- CRAWFORD, M. H. (ed.) (1996), *Roman Statutes*, 2 vols. (London).
- CRISTOFANI, M. (1996), *Due testi dell'Italia preromana. 1. Per regna Maricae, 2. Aequipondium Etruscum* (Rome).
- CROFT, W. (1990), *Typology and Universals* (Cambridge).
- CRUTTENDEN, A. (1997), *Intonation*, 2nd edn. (Cambridge).
- DAHL, Ö. (1987), *Tense and Aspect Systems*, 2nd edn. (Oxford).
- D'ANNA, G. (ed.) (1967), *M. Pacuvio: M. Pacuvii fragmenta* (Rome).
- DAUBE, D. (1956), *Forms of Roman Legislation* (Oxford).
- DELBRÜCK, B. (1897), *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*, 2nd part (Strassburg).
- DEVINE, A. M., and STEPHENS, L. D. (1980), review of E. Pulgram, *Latin-Romance Phonology: Prosodics and Metrics* (Munich, 1975), *CPh* 75: 142–57.
- DIK, S. C. (1997), *The Theory of Functional Grammar*, 2nd edn. (ed. K. Hengeveld), 2 vols. (Berlin and New York).
- DIXON, R. M. W. (2000), 'A Typology of Causatives: Form, Syntax and Meaning', in R. M. W. Dixon and A. Y. Aikhenvald (eds.), *Changing Valency: Case Studies in Transitivity* (Cambridge), 30–83.

- DONALDSON, T. (1994), 'Ngiyampaa', in N. Thieberger and W. McGregor (eds.), *Macquarie Aboriginal Words* (Sydney), 23–40.
- DRESSLER, W. (1968), *Studien zur verbalen Pluralität: Iterativum, Distributivum, Durativum, Intensivum in der allgemeinen Grammatik, im Lateinischen und Hethitischen* (Vienna).
- (1973), 'Pour une stylistique phonologique du latin à propos des styles négligents d'une langue morte', *BSL* 68: 129–45.
- DREXLER, H. (1969), *Die Iamben Kürzung: Kürzung der zweiten Silbe eines iambischen Wortes, eines iambischen Wortanfangs* (Hildesheim).
- ELMER, H. C. (1894), 'The Latin Prohibitive', *AJPh* 15: 133–53, 299–328.
- ENGELBRECHT, A. (ed.) (1885), *Claudian Mamerti opera* (Vienna).
- ENKVIST, N. E. (1964), 'On Defining Style: An Essay in Applied Linguistics', in J. Spencer (ed.), *Linguistics and Style* (Oxford), 1–56.
- EULER, W. (1993), 'Oskisch-Umbrisch, Venetisch und Lateinisch: Grammatische Kategorien zur inneritalischen Sprachverwandtschaft', in Rix (1993), 96–105.
- ÉVRARD, É., and MELLET, S. (1998), 'Les Méthodes quantitatives en langues anciennes', *Lalies* 18: 111–55.
- FISCHER, O. (1992), 'Syntax', in N. Blake (ed.), *The Cambridge History of the English Language*, ii: 1066–1476 (Cambridge), 207–408.
- FLEISCHMAN, S. (1982), *The Future in Thought and Language: Diachronic Evidence from Romance* (Cambridge).
- FRAENKEL, E. (1960), *Elementi plautini in Plauto* (Florence).
- FUNAIOLI, H. (ed.) (1907), *Grammaticae Romanae fragmenta*, i (Leipzig).
- GAFFIOT, F. (1933), 'Le Futur antérieur dans les propositions indépendantes et principales', *RPh*, 3rd ser. 7: 164–84.
- GARCÍA RAMÓN, J. L. (1993), 'Zur Morphosyntax der passivischen Infinitive im Oskisch-Umbrischen: u. -f(e)i, o. -fir und ursabell. \*-fīē (\*-d<sup>h</sup>īeh<sub>1</sub>)', in Rix (1993), 106–24.
- GERSCHNER, R. (2002), *Die Deklination der Nomina bei Plautus* (Heidelberg).
- GILLELAND, M. E. (1980), 'Female Speech in Greek and Latin', *AJPh* 101: 180–3.
- GIPPERT, J. (1999), 'Das lateinische Imperfekt in sprachvergleichender Hinsicht', in P. Anreiter and E. Jerem (eds.), *Studia Celtica et Indogermanica: Festschrift für Wolfgang Meid zum 70. Geburtstag* (Budapest), 125–37.
- GIVÓN, T. (2001), *Syntax: An Introduction*, ii (Amsterdam and Philadelphia).
- GODEL, R. (1979), 'Le Subjonctif latin *duim* (*duam*)', *Glotta* 57: 230–6.
- GRASSI, C. (1966), *Problemi di sintassi latina* (Florence).
- (1973), 'Über das sogenannte "Meyersche Kriterium"', in Strunk (1973), 368–87.

- GRATWICK, A. S. (1982), 'Drama', in E. J. Kenney and W. V. Clausen (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, ii: *Latin Literature* (Cambridge), 77–137.
- GREEN, R. P. H. (1994), *Decimi Magni Ausonii opera* (Oxford).
- HAFFTER, H. (1934), *Untersuchungen zur altlateinischen Dichtersprache* (Berlin).
- HAMP, E. P. (1954), 'The Relationship of Venetic within Italic', *AJPh* 75: 183–6.
- HAPP, H. (1967), 'Die lateinische Umgangssprache und die Kunstsprache des Plautus', *Glotta* 45: 60–104.
- HARVEY JR., P. B. (2000), 'The Inscribed Bowl from the Garigliano (Minturnae): Local Diversity and Romanization in the 4th c. B.C.', *JRA* 13: 164–74.
- HASSALL, M. W. C., and TOMLIN, R. S. O. (1993), 'Roman Britain in 1992: II. Inscriptions', *Britannia* 24: 310–22.
- HAVERLING, G. (2002), 'On the Semantic Functions of the Latin Perfect', in Bolkestein, Kroon, Pinkster, Rummelink, and Risselada (2002), 153–67.
- HEINE, B., CLAUDI, U., and HÜNNEMEYER, F. (1991), *Grammaticalization: A Conceptual Framework* (Chicago).
- HERTZ, M., and KEIL, H. (ed.) (1855–70), *Grammatici Latini*, 8 vols. (Leipzig) (supplement (viii) by H. Hagen).
- HETTRICH, H. (1987), 'Zur Entwicklung der Finalsätze altindogermanischer Sprachen', *ZVS* 100: 219–37.
- (1992), 'Lateinische Konditionalsätze in sprachvergleichender Sicht', in Panagl and Krisch (1992), 263–84.
- (1997), 'Syntaktische Rekonstruktion bei Delbrück und heute: Nochmals zum lateinischen und griechischen Acl', in E. Crespo and J. L. García Ramón (eds.), *Berthold Delbrück y la sintaxis indoeuropea hoy: Actas del Coloquio de la Indogermanische Gesellschaft, Madrid, 21–24 de septiembre de 1994* (Madrid and Wiesbaden), 219–38.
- HEWSON, J., and BUBENIK, V. (1997), *Tense and Aspect in Indo-European Languages: Theory, Typology, Diachrony* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia).
- HOFFMANN, K. (1970), 'Das Kategoriensystem des indogermanischen Verbums', *MSS* 28: 19–41.
- HOFMANN, J. B., and RICOTTILLI, L. (1985), *La lingua d'uso latina*, 2nd edn. (Bologna).
- HORNSTEIN, N. (1990), *As Time Goes By: Tense and Universal Grammar* (Cambridge, Mass., and London).
- HORROCKS, G. (1997), 'Homer's Dialect', in Morris and Powell (1997), 193–217.

- HORSFALL, N. (1989), *Cornelius Nepos: A Selection, Including the Lives of Cato and Atticus; Translated with Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford).
- HOUT, M. P. J. VAN DEN (ed.) (1988), *M. Cornelii Frontonis Epistulae* (Leipzig).
- JASANOFF, J. H. (1987), 'The Tenses of the Latin Perfect System', in G. Cardona and N. H. Zide (eds.), *Festschrift for Henry Hoenigswald on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* (Tübingen), 177–83.
- (1988), 'PIE \**ǵnē*- "Recognize, Know"', in A. Bammesberger (ed.), *Die Laryngalthorie und die Rekonstruktion des indogermanischen Laut- und Formensystems* (Heidelberg), 227–39.
- (1991), 'The Origin of the Italic Imperfect Subjunctive', *HSF* 104: 84–105.
- (1994), 'The Brittonic Subjunctive and Future', in J. E. Rasmussen and B. Nielsen (eds.), *In honorem Holger Pedersen: Kolloquium der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 25. bis 28. März 1993 in Kopenhagen* (Wiesbaden), 199–220.
- JENKINS, E. B. (1932), *Index verborum Terentianus* (Chapel Hill).
- JOCELYN, H. D. (ed.) (1967), *The Tragedies of Ennius: The Fragments Edited with an Introduction and Commentary* (Cambridge).
- KALB, W. (1888), *Das Juristenlatein: Versuch einer Charakteristik auf der Grundlage der Digesten*, 2nd edn. (Nuremberg).
- KAUER, R., and LINDSAY, W. M. (eds.) (1926), *P. Terenti Afri Comoediae* (Oxford) (repr. with additions by O. Skutsch, 1958).
- KLEIN, W. (1994), *Time in Language* (London).
- KLOTZ, A. (ed.) (1923), *In C. Verrem actionis secundae libri I–III* (Leipzig).
- KRANER, F., DITTENBERGER, W., MEUSEL, H., and OPPERMANN, H. (eds.) (1960), *C. Iulii Caesaris Commentarii de bello Gallico*, 18th edn. (Berlin).
- KREBS, J. PH., and SCHMALZ, J. H. (1905), *Antibarbarus der lateinischen Sprache: Nebst einem kurzen Abriss der Geschichte der lateinischen Sprache und Vorbemerkungen über reine Latinität*, 7th edn., ii (Basle).
- KROON, C. H. M. (1995), *Discourse Particles in Latin: A Study of nam, enim, autem, vero and at* (Amsterdam).
- LANDFESTER, M. (1997), *Einführung in die Stilistik der griechischen und lateinischen Literatursprachen* (Darmstadt).
- LANDGRAF, G. (1914), *Kommentar zu Ciceros Rede Pro Sex. Roscio Amerino*, 2nd edn. (Leipzig and Berlin).
- LATTE, K. (1932), 'Randbemerkungen', *Philologus* 87: 265–76.
- LEBRETON, J. (1901), *Études sur la langue et la grammaire de Cicéron* (Paris).
- LEECH, G. N. (1976), *Meaning and the English Verb* (London).

- LEEMAN, A. D., PINKSTER, H., and WISSE, J. (1996), *De oratore libri III*, iv: *Buch II*, 291–367; *Buch III*, 1–95 (Heidelberg).
- LEJEUNE, M. (1974), *Manuel de la langue vénète* (Heidelberg).
- LEO, F. (ed.) (1895–6), *Plauti comoediae*, 2 vols. (Berlin).
- LEOPOLD, J. H. (1904), *Quid Postgatius de origine Latini infinitivi et participii futuri activi senserit* (diss., Leeuwarden).
- LEUMANN, M. (1973), 'Zur Vorgeschichte der lateinischen Finalsätze mit *ut*', in Strunk (1973), 421–5.
- LINDSAY, W. M. (1896), *An Introduction to Latin Textual Emendation Based on the Text of Plautus* (London).
- (ed.) (1900), *The Captivi of Plautus, Edited with Introduction, Apparatus Criticus and Commentary* (London).
- (ed.) (1903), *Nonii Marcelli De compendiosa doctrina libri XX*, 3 vols. (Leipzig).
- (ed.) (1904–5), *T. Macci Plauti Comoediae*, 2 vols. (Oxford).
- (1907), *Syntax of Plautus* (Oxford).
- (ed.) (1913), *Sexti Pompei Festi De verborum significatu quae supersunt cum Pauli epitome* (Leipzig).
- (1922), *Early Latin Verse* (Oxford).
- LODGE, G. (1924–33), *Lexicon Plautinum*, 2 vols. (Stuttgart).
- LÖFSTEDT, L. (1966), *Les Expressions du commandement et de la défense en latin et leur survie dans les langues romanes* (Helsinki).
- LÜHR, R. (1993), 'Zur Umstrukturierung von agenshaltigen Sachverhaltsbeschreibungen in Komplementfunktion: Dargestellt an altindogermanischen Sprachen', *HSF* 106: 232–61.
- MACCARY, W. T., and WILLCOCK, M. M. (eds.) (1976), *Plautus: Casina* (Cambridge).
- MCCONE, K. R. (1991), *The Indo-European Origins of the Old Irish Nasal Presents, Subjunctives and Futures* (Innsbruck).
- MCGLYNN, P. (1963–7), *Lexicon Terentianum*, 2 vols. (London and Glasgow).
- McKAY, K. L. (1986), 'Aspects of the Imperative in Ancient Greek', *Antichthon* 20: 41–58.
- MADVIG, J. N. (1887), 'De formarum quarundarum verbi Latini natura et usu disputatio', in id., *Opuscula academica: Ab ipso iterum collecta, emendata, aucta* (Copenhagen), 448–503.
- MALTBY, R. (1979), 'Linguistic Characterization of Old Men in Terence', *CPh* 74: 136–47.
- MANCINI, M. (1997), *Osservazioni sulla nuova epigrafe del Garigliano* (Rome).
- MARTIN, R. H. (ed.) (1976), *Terence: Adelphoe* (Cambridge).

- and WOODMAN, A. J. (eds.) (1989), *Tacitus: Annals Book IV* (Cambridge).
- MARTINET, A. (1955), *Économie des changements phonétiques: Traité de phonologie diachronique* (Bern).
- MARX, F. (ed.) (1928), *Plautus Rudens: Text und Kommentar* (Leipzig).
- MAURACH, G. (ed.) (1988), *Der Poenulus des Plautus* (Heidelberg).
- MEIER-BRÜGGER, M., FRITZ, M., and MAYRHOFER, M. (2002), *Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft*, 8th edn. (Berlin and New York).
- MEIFART, T. (1885), *De futuri exacti usu Plautino* (diss., Jena).
- MEILLET, A. (1948), *Esquisse d'une histoire de la langue latine*, 5th edn. (Paris).
- MEISER, G. (1986), *Lautgeschichte der umbrischen Sprache* (Innsbruck).
- (1993), 'Uritalische Modusyntax: Zur Genese des Konjunktiv Imperfekt', in Rix (1993), 167–95.
- (1998), *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache* (Darmstadt).
- (2003), *Veni Vidi Vici: Die Vorgeschichte des lateinischen Perfektsystems* (Munich).
- MELLET, S. (1994), 'Les Temps du futur: le futur du *perfectum*', in S. Mellet, M.-D. Joffre, and G. Serbat (eds.), *Grammaire fondamentale du latin: le signifié du verbe* (Louvain and Paris), 150–69.
- MELO, W. D. C. DE (2002a), Review of Müller-Wetzel (2001), *Gymnasium* 109: 551–2.
- (2002b), 'The Sigmatic Future in Plautus', in Bolkestein, Kroon, Pinkster, Rummelink, and Risselada (2002), 75–90.
- (2002c), 'The Type *faxo* in Plautus and Terence', *OUWPLPP* 7: 163–80.
- (2004a), 'Gab es im Uritalischen einen *ā*-Präventiv?', *HSF* 117: 249–68.
- (2004b), *Traces of an Earlier Verbal System in Archaic Latin: The Meaning and Usage of the Types *faxō/faxim/impetrāssere, duim, and attigās**, 2 vols. (diss., Oxford).
- (2005), 'The Sigmatic Subjunctive in Plautus and Terence', in G. Calboli (ed.), *Papers on Grammar: IX 1. Latina Lingua! Proceedings of the Twelfth International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics (Bologna, 9–14 June 2003)* (Rome), 45–56.
- (2006), 'If in Doubt, Leave It In: Subject Accusatives in Plautus and Terence', *OUWPLPP* 11: 5–20.
- (forthcoming), 'The Sigmatic Future and the Genetic Affiliation of Venetic: Latin *faxō* "I shall make" and Venetic *vha.g.s.to* "he made"', *TPhS*.
- MENGE, H., BURKARD, T., and SCHAUER, M. (2000), *Lehrbuch der lateinischen Syntax und Semantik* (Darmstadt).

- METHNER, R. (1921), 'Zu dem Aufsatz von H. Blase "Zum Konjunktiv im Lateinischen"', *Glotta* X S. 30 ff.; *Glotta* 11: 204–5.
- MILLER, N. P. (1970), 'An Aspect of Tacitean Style', *BICS* 17: 111–19.
- MONACO, G. (ed.) (1969), *Plauto: Curculio* (Palermo).
- MORRIS, E. P. (1897), 'The Subjunctive in Independent Sentences in Plautus: II. Forces', *AJPh* 18: 275–301.
- MORRIS, I., and POWELL, B. (eds.) (1997), *A New Companion to Homer* (Leiden, New York, and Cologne).
- MÜLLER, R. (2002), 'Totus prope mutatus est sermo: Römische Konzeptionen des Sprachwandels', in Bolkestein, Kroon, Pinkster, Remmelink, and Riselada (2002), 263–71.
- MÜLLER-WETZEL, M. (2001), *Der lateinische Konjunktiv: Seine Einheit als deiktische Kategorie; eine Erklärung der modalen Systeme der klassischen Zeit* (Hildesheim, Zürich, and New York).
- NARTEN, J. (1973), 'Zur Flexion des lateinischen Perfekts', *MSS* 31: 133–50.
- NEUE, F., and WAGENER, C. (1897), *Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*, iii: *Das Verbum*, 3rd edn. (Berlin).
- NISBET, R. G. (1923), 'Voluntas fati in Latin Syntax', *AJPh* 44: 27–43.
- NIXON, P. (ed.) (1916–38), *Plautus*, 5 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., and London).
- NOVAKOVA, I. (2000), 'Le Futur antérieur français: temps, aspect, modalités', *ZFSL* 110: 113–35.
- NUTTING, H. C. (1926), 'The Form si sit... erit', *UCPCP* 8: 187–217.
- OAKLEY, S. P. (1997), *A Commentary on Livy Books VI–X, i: Introduction and Book VI* (Oxford).
- OCHS, E. (1979), 'Planned and Unplanned Discourse', in T. Givón (ed.), *Discourse and Syntax* (New York, San Francisco, and London), 51–80.
- ÖETTINGER, N. (1984), 'Zur Diskussion um den lateinischen *ā*-Konjunktiv', *Glotta* 62: 187–201.
- OLDSJÖ, F. (2001), *Tense and Aspect in Caesar's Narrative* (diss., Uppsala).
- OLZSCHA, K. (1963), 'Literaturbericht über Italische Sprachen 1939–1962', *Glotta* 41: 70–138.
- ÖNNERFORS, A. (1956), *Pliniana: In Plinii Maioris Naturalem Historiam studia grammatica semantica critica* (diss., Uppsala and Wiesbaden).
- PALANDER-COLLIN, M. (1999), *Grammaticalization and Social Embedding: I Think and Methinks in Middle and Early Modern English* (Helsinki).
- PALMER, A. (ed.) (1890), *T. Macci Plauti Amphitruo: The Amphitruo of Plautus, Edited with Introduction and Notes* (London and New York).
- PALMER, F. R. (1986), *Mood and Modality* (Cambridge).
- PANAGL, O., and KRISCH, T. (eds.) (1992), *Latein und Indogermanisch: Akten des Kolloquiums der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, 23.–26. September 1986* (Innsbruck).

- PASCUCCI, G. (1961), 'Nedum', *SIFC*, NS 33: 127–53.
- PEDERSEN, H. (1921), *Les Formes sigmatiques du verbe latin et le problème du futur indo-européen* (Copenhagen).
- PEIPER, R. (ed.) (1886), *Decimi Magni Ausonii Burdigalensis opuscula* (Leipzig).
- PENNEY, J. H. W. (1988), 'The Languages of Italy', in J. Boardman, N. G. L. Hammond, D. M. Lewis, and M. Ostwald (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History*, iv: *Persia, Greece and the Western Mediterranean c. 525–479 B.C.*, 2nd edn. (Cambridge), 720–38, 875–82.
- PETERSMANN, H. (ed.) (1973), *T. Maccius Plautus: Stichus; Einleitung, Text, Kommentar* (Heidelberg).
- (1977), *Petrone urbane Prosa: Untersuchungen zu Sprache und Text (Syntax)* (Vienna).
- PFISTER, R. (1936), *Zum Aspekt der Verba des Sehens bei Plautus* (diss., Speyer).
- (1995), 'Der Nebensatz: Ein Fachwort ohne Randschärfe', in D. Longrée (ed.), *De usu: Études de syntaxe latine offertes en hommage à Marius Lavency* (Louvain-la-neuve), 237–46.
- PILLINGER, O. S. (1980), 'The Accusative and Infinitive in Latin: A Refractory Complement Clause', *JL* 16: 55–83.
- PINKSTER, H. (1983), 'Tempus, Aspect and Aktionsart in Latin', in H. Temporini and W. Haase (eds.), *ANRW* ii. 29. 1: 270–320.
- (1985a), 'The Development of Future Tense Auxiliaries in Latin', *Glotta* 63: 186–208.
- (1985b), 'The Discourse Function of the Passive', in A. M. Bolkestein, C. de Groot, and J. L. Mackenzie (eds.), *Syntax and Pragmatics in Functional Grammar* (Dordrecht), 107–18.
- (1986), 'Three Notes on the Latin Subjunctive', *RISSH* 22: 147–56.
- (1990), *Latin Syntax and Semantics* (transl. H. Mulder) (London).
- (1998), 'Is the Latin Present Tense the Unmarked, Neutral Tense in the System?', in R. Risselada (ed.), *Latin in Use: Amsterdam Studies in the Pragmatics of Latin* (Amsterdam), 63–83.
- PLANTA, R. VON (1897), *Grammatik der oskisch-umbrischen Dialekte*, ii: *Formenlehre, Syntax, Sammlung der Inschriften und Glossen, Anhang, Glossar* (Strasburg).
- PORZIG, W. (1960), 'Altitalische Sprachgeographie', in H. Hartmann and H. Neumann (eds.), *Indogermanica: Festschrift für Wolfgang Krause zum 65. Geburtstage am 18. September 1960 von Fachgenossen und Freunden dargebracht* (Heidelberg), 170–89.
- POSTGATE, J. P. (1894), 'The Future Infinitive Active in Latin', *IF* 4: 252–8.
- (1904), 'The Latin Future Infinitive (*crambe repetita*)', *CR* 18: 450–6.

- POWELL, J. G. F. (2005), 'Cicero's Adaptation of Legal Latin in the *De legibus*', in Reinhardt, Lapidge, and Adams (2005), 117–50.
- QUESTA, C. (1967), *Introduzione alla metrica di Plauto* (Bologna).
- (ed.) (1995), *Titi Macci Plauti cantica* (Urbino).
- REINHARDT, T., LAPIDGE, M., and ADAMS, J. N. (eds.) (2005), *Aspects of the Language of Latin Prose* (Oxford).
- REINHOLD, H. (1956), 'Zum lateinischen Verbalaspekt', *ZVS* 74: 1–44.
- RIBBECK, O. (ed.) (1871–3), *Scaenicae Romanorum poesis fragmenta*, 2nd edn., 2 vols. (Leipzig).
- RIEMANN, O. (1886), 'La Question de l'impératif latin en -to', *RPh* 10: 161–87.
- RISCH, E. (1954), 'Der Typus *parturire* im Lateinischen', *IF* 61: 187–95.
- RISSELADA, R. (1993), *Imperatives and Other Directive Expressions in Latin: A Study in the Pragmatics of a Dead Language* (Amsterdam).
- (2000), 'The End of Time: A Perfect Future in Latin?', in C. H. M. Kroon and D. den Hengst (eds.), *Ultima Aetas: Time, Tense and Transience in the Ancient World; Studies in Honour of Jan den Boeft* (Amsterdam), 25–39.
- RIX, H. (1976), 'Die umbrischen Infinitive auf -fi und die urindogermanische Infinitivendung -d<sup>h</sup>iō̃', in A. E. Morpurgo Davies and W. Meid (eds.), *Studies in Greek, Italic, and Indo-European Linguistics Offered to Leonard R. Palmer on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday June 5, 1976* (Innsbruck), 319–31.
- (1977), 'Das keltische Verbalsystem auf dem Hintergrund des indoiranisch-griechischen Rekonstruktionsmodells', in K. H. Schmidt (ed.), *Indogermanisch und Keltisch: Kolloquium der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft am 16. und 17. Februar 1976 in Bonn* (Wiesbaden), 132–58.
- (1986), *Zur Entstehung des urindogermanischen Modussystems* (Innsbruck).
- (1989), 'Dichtersprachliche Traditionen aus vorliterarischer Zeit?', in G. Vogt-Spira (ed.), *Studien zur vorliterarischen Periode im frühen Rom* (Tübingen), 29–39.
- (1992), 'Zur Entstehung des lateinischen Perfektparadigmas', in Panagl and Krisch (1992), 221–40.
- (ed.) (1993), *Oskisch-Umbrisch: Texte und Grammatik, Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft und der Società Italiana di Glottologia vom 25. bis 28. September 1991 in Freiburg* (Wiesbaden).
- (1994a), *Die Termini der Unfreiheit in den Sprachen Alt-Italiens* (Stuttgart).
- (1994b), 'Latein und Sabellisch: Stammbaum und/oder Sprachbund?', *ILing* 17: 13–29.

- (1998a), 'Bemerkungen zu den lateinischen Verbformen des Typs *faxo faxim*', in J. H. Jasanoff, H. C. Melchert, and L. Oliver (eds.), *Mír Curad: Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins* (Innsbruck), 619–34.
- (1998b), 'Eine neue frühsabellische Inschrift und der altitalische Präventiv', *HSF* 111: 247–69.
- (2002), *Sabellische Texte: Die Texte des Oskischen, Umbrischen und Süd-pikenischen* (Heidelberg).
- ROBERTS, I. (1997), *Comparative Syntax* (London, New York, Sydney, and Auckland).
- ROBINS, R. H. (1997), *A Short History of Linguistics*, 4th edn. (London).
- ROSÉN, H. (1999), *Latine loqui: Trends and Directions in the Crystallization of Classical Latin* (Munich).
- ST. JOHN, J. (1974), 'Archaic Latin *faxit* etc.', *ZVS* 88: 147–53.
- SARGEANT, J. (ed.) (1914), *P. Terenti Phormio* (Cambridge).
- SCHAUWECKER, Y. (2002), 'Zum Sprechverhalten der Frauentypen bei Plautus', *Gymnasium* 109: 191–211.
- SCHRIJVER, P. (1991), *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Latin* (Amsterdam, Ga., and Atlanta, Ga.).
- SCHUMACHER, S., SCHULZE-THULIN, B., and WIEL, C. AAN DE (2004), *Die keltischen Primärverben: Ein vergleichendes, etymologisches und morphologisches Lexikon* (Innsbruck).
- SCHÜTZ, H. (1929), 'Die Konjunktiv- und Futurformen auf -ero -erim im Lateinischen', *Glotta* 17: 161–90.
- SERBAT, G. (1975), 'Les Temps du verbe en latin', *REL* 53: 367–405.
- (1978), 'Le «Futur antérieur» chez les grammairiens latins', in J. Collart (ed.), *Varron, grammaire antique et stylistique latine* (Paris), 263–72.
- (1980), 'Exposé d'introduction', in id. (ed.), *Le sens du parfait de l'indicatif actif en Latin: Colloque de Morigny 2 Déc. 78* (Paris), 4–11.
- SHIPP, G. B. (1953), 'Greek in Plautus', *WS* 66: 105–12.
- (ed.) (1960), *P. Terenti Afri Andria: With Introduction and Commentary*, 2nd edn. (Oxford).
- SJÖGREN, H. (1906), *Zum Gebrauch des Futurums im Altlateinischen* (Uppsala and Leipzig).
- SKUTSCH, F. (1912), 'Die Konjunktive auf -assim und -essim', *Glotta* 3: 99–104.
- SLOMAN, A. (ed.) (1886), *P. Terenti Adelphi: With Notes and Introductions* (Oxford).
- SONNENSCHNIG, E. A. (ed.) (1891), *T. Macci Plauti Rudens: Edited with Critical and Explanatory Notes* (Oxford).
- SOUBIRAN, J. (1971), review of Drexler (1969), *Gnomon* 43: 408–11.

- STEMPEL, R. (1997), 'Zur Vorgeschichte und Entwicklung des lateinischen Tempus- und Modusystems', *HSF* 111: 270–85.
- STOCKERT, W. (ed.) (1983), *T. Maccius Plautus: Aulularia* (Stuttgart).
- (2004), 'Schwören auch Frauen bei Herkules? Bemerkungen zu *Cist.* 52 und anderen Plautus-Stellen', in R. Hartkamp and F. Hurka (eds.), *Studien zu Plautus' Cistellaria* (Tübingen), 363–9.
- STRUNK, K. (1968), 'Zeit und Tempus in altindogermanischen Sprachen', *IF* 73: 279–311.
- (ed.) (1973), *Probleme der lateinischen Grammatik* (Darmstadt).
- STURTEVANT, E. H. (1911), 'Latin *ss* instead of Intervocalic *r*', *CPh* 6: 221.
- SYME, R. (1958), *Tacitus*, i (Oxford).
- SZEMERÉNYI, O. J. L. (1953), 'The Future Imperative of Indo-European', *RBPh* 31: 937–54.
- (1987a), 'Ein lateinischer Lautwandel: *ōw* > *āw*?', in O. Szemerényi, *Scripta Minora; Selected Essays in Indo-European, Greek, and Latin*, ii: *Latin*, ed. P. Considine and J. T. Hooker (Innsbruck), 602–27.
- (1987b), 'Si parentem puer verberit, ast olle plorassit', *ibid.* 892–910.
- THILO, G., and HAGEN, H. (eds.) (1878–1902), *Servii Grammatici qui feruntur In Vergilii carmina commentarii*, 3 vols. (Leipzig and Berlin).
- THOMAS, F. (1935), 'Sur les désidératifs latins en *-essō*', *RPh*, 3rd ser. 9: 280–7.
- (1938), *Recherches sur le subjonctif latin: Histoire et valeur des formes* (Paris).
- (1949), 'Remarques sur la concordance des temps du subjonctif en latin', *RPh*, 3rd ser. 23: 133–50.
- (1956), 'Du latin *faxō/faxim*, *legam*, *-ās*, etc. à l'«injonctif»', *RPh*, 3rd ser. 30: 204–23.
- THOMPSON, S. A., and MULAC, A. (1991), 'A Quantitative Perspective on the Grammaticization of Epistemic Parentheticals in English', in E. C. Traugott and B. Heine (eds.), *Approaches to Grammaticalization*, ii: *Focus on Types of Grammatical Markers* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia), 313–29.
- THURNEYSSEN, R. (1946), *A Grammar of Old Irish*, rev. edn. (transl. D. A. Binchy and O. Bergin) (Dublin).
- TOMLIN, R. S. O. (1988), 'The Curse Tablets', in B. Cunliffe (ed.), *The Temple of Sulis Minerva at Bath*, ii (Oxford), 59–277.
- TRONSKIJ, I. M. (1973), 'Bemerkungen zum Aspekt- und Tempussystem des lateinischen Verbums', in Strunk (1973), 355–67.
- TROST, P. (1939), 'Zum lateinischen Konditionalsatz', *Glotta* 27: 206–11.
- TYRRELL, R. Y. (ed.) (1927), *The Miles Gloriosus of T. Maccius Plautus: A Revised Text, with Notes* (London).

- UNTERMANN, J. (1980), 'Die venetische Sprache: Bericht und Besinnung', *Glotta* 58: 281–317.
- (1993), 'Gr. ἔθηξα = lat. feci, gr. ῥηξα = lat. ieci?', in G. Meiser, J. Bendahman, J. A. Harðarson, and C. Schaefer (eds.), *Indogermanica et Italica: Festschrift für Helmut Rix zum 65. Geburtstag* (Innsbruck), 461–8.
- (2000), *Wörterbuch des Oskisch-Umbrischen* (Heidelberg).
- VAIREL(-CARRON), H. (1975), *Exclamation; ordre et défense: analyse de deux systèmes syntaxiques en latin* (Paris).
- (1978a), 'Du subjonctif parfait «aoristique» au subjonctif parfait de moindre actualisation', *RPh*, 3rd ser. 52: 308–30.
- (1978b), 'La Valeur de l'opposition infectum/perfectum en latin: examen et critique des diverses interprétations proposées, valeur en langue et valeurs d'emploi des formes du perfectum', *REL* 56: 380–412.
- (1981), 'Les Énoncés prohibitifs au subjonctif: «ne facias», «ne feceris» et «ne faxis»', *RPh*, 3rd ser. 55: 249–72.
- VALLEJO, J. (1942), 'Sobre el subjuntivo latino (Examen de la doctrina del Prof. Thomas.)', *Emerita* 10: 287–307.
- (1951), 'Faxolfaxim y fecerolfecerim en las frases condicionales latinas', *Emerita* 19: 237–9.
- VET, C. (1990), 'Asymmetries in the Use of Tense and Modality', in J. Nuyts, A. M. Bolkestein, and C. Vet (eds.), *Layers and Levels of Representation in Language Theory: A Functional View* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia), 123–37.
- VETTER, E. (1953), *Handbuch der italischen Dialekte*, i: *Texte mit Erklärung, Glossen, Wörterverzeichnis* (Heidelberg).
- VINE, B. (1998), 'Remarks on the Archaic Latin "Garigliano Bowl" Inscription', *ZPE* 121: 257–62.
- VOLKMANN, A., HAMMER, C., and GLEDITSCH, H. (1901), *Rhetorik und Metrik der Griechen und Römer* (Munich).
- WACKERNAGEL, J. (1926), *Vorlesungen über Syntax mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch und Deutsch*, 2nd edn., i (Basle).
- WALLACE, R. E. (1982), 'A Note on the Phonostylistics of Latin: (s) in Plautus', *Glotta* 60: 120–4.
- and JOSEPH, B. D. (1991), 'On the Problematic f/h Variation in Faliscan', *Glotta* 69: 84–93.
- WARMINGTON, E. H. (ed.) (1936–40), *Remains of Old Latin*, ii and iv (London and Cambridge, Mass.).
- WATTS, R. J. (2003), *Politeness* (Cambridge).
- WEST, M. (1997), 'Homer's Meter', in Morris and Powell (1997), 218–37.
- WILKINS, A. S. (ed.) (1892), *M. Tulli Ciceronis De oratore libri tres: With Introduction and Notes* (Oxford).

- WIRTZFELD, A. (1888), *De consecutione temporum Plautina et Terentiana: Commentatio grammatica* (diss., Siegburg).
- WOODS, A., FLETCHER, P., and HUGHES, A. (1986), *Statistics in Language Studies* (Cambridge).
- WOYTEK, E. (ed.) (1982), *T. Maccius Plautus: Persa; Einleitung, Text und Kommentar* (Vienna).
- YOUTIE, H. C., and WINTER, J. G. (eds.) (1951), *Michigan Papyri, viii: Papyri and Ostraca from Karanis, 2nd series* (Ann Arbor and London).

## *Index of Passages*

I have not separated Latin and Greek texts.

ACCIIUS

*trag.*

102: 286

304: 284

555–6: 203

AFRANIUS

*com.*

67: 180

279–80: 286

AUGUSTINE

*dial.*

2: 355–6

CAESAR

*Gall.*

1. 2. 1: 59

1. 15. 1: 63

6. 9. 7: 164–5

6. 29. 5: 164–5

7. 4. 4: 63

CATO

*agr.*

53: 96

*orat.*

166: 323 n. 32

CATULLUS

61. 195–6: 219

66. 18: 218

66. 89–92: 222

CICERO

*ac.*

2. 3: 82 n. 43

*ad Q. fr.*

3. 7 (9). 4: 124, 126

*Att.*

3. 6. 1: 58

3. 10. 1: 61

7. 3. 2: 56

7. 14. 2: 233

9. 10. 6: 309

11. 16. 5: 95

*Brut.*

192: 71–2

*Cael.*

79: 97–8

*Cluent.*

95: 101 n. 19

*de orat.*

1. 33: 83–4

*diu.*

2. 1: 64

*fam.*

2. 11. 1: 58–9

6. 4. 5: 42

6. 7. 1: 67–8

13. 44: 80

*fin.*

3. 75: 62

*Lael.*

10: 124

*leg.*

2. 18: 342

*Manil.*

27: 68–9

*nat. deor.*

1. 45: 74

2. 2: 64

3. 14: 59

*off.*

2. 40: 81–2

*orat.*

155: 238

*Quinct.*

29: 164–5

*Rab. Post.*

4: 58–9

*rep.*

1. 10: 78

2. 23: 83

*S. Rosc.*

56: 61

73: 124 n. 54

CICERO (*cont.*)*Tusc.*

5. 55: 58

*Verr.*

ii. 2. 191: 68

ii. 3. 81: 346

ii. 4. 71: 68–9

ii. 5. 27: 82

## CLEDONIUS

*gramm.*

v. 59. 24: 351

## CONSENTIUS

*gramm.*

v. 375. 7–10: 23

v. 382. 10–16: 350

*Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*

ii. 3. 41: 228

v. 15. 30: 228

*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*  
and other inscriptions*Britannia* 1993, 24: 312: 342–3*CIL* i<sup>2</sup>. 1: 308 n. 6*CIL* i<sup>2</sup>. 581: 232*ZPE* 1998, 121: 257–8: 113

n. 40

## CURTIUS RUFUS

10. 6. 20: 222

## DONATUS

*de com.*

8. 9: 8

*Ter. Andr.*

598: 108–9

## ENNIUS

*ann.*

133: 157

335–7: 217

335: 175 n. 12

*fr. uar.*

17–18: 201

*scaen.*

142: 283

170–1: 282 n. 24

201: 303

261: 207

## EUGRAPHIUS

*Ter. Phorm.*

742: 352 n. 31

## EURIPIDES

*Alcestis*

538–9: 102–3

*Electra*

1165: 102–3

## EUTYCHES

*gramm.*

v. 485. 14: 169

## FESTUS

p. 260: 223

p. 490: 361–2

## FORTUNATIANUS

*rhet.*

3. 7: 345

## FRONTO

p. 139. 5–8: 359

## HORACE

*sat.*

2. 6. 4–5: 346

## JUVENAL

7. 154: 19

*Laws*

## Lex Cincia

fr. Vat. 307: 263

## Lex XII tab.

ap. Fest. p. 496: 175 n. 12

ap. Gaius *inst.* 1. 132: 261–2ap. Gaius *inst.* 2. 224: 171ap. Macr. *Sat.* 1. 4. 19: 171

## Lex reg.

ap. Fest. p. 260: 175 n. 12

ap. Paul. Fest. p. 5: 188

ap. Paul. Fest. p. 247: 261–2

## Lex Sil.

ap. Fest. p. 288: 262

## LIVIVS ANDRONICUS

*trag.*

23: 283

## LIVY

7. 1. 7: 85–6

10. 19. 17: 354–5

## LUCILIUS

682–3: 225–6

1195: 201 n. 33

- MACROBIUS 330: 85, 100–1  
*Sat.* 337: 231  
 3. 9. 11: 178 608: 128–9  
 MICHIGAN PAPYRI 671–3: 254  
*P. Mich.* viii. 468. 36–8: 148 745–6: 66–7  
 n. 23 803: 113  
 924: 109  
 984–5: 280–1, 289  
 NAEVIUS *Asin.*  
*com.* 131–2: 186  
 125: 131 n. 63 256: 125  
 NONIUS 286: 199  
 p. 106. 25–6: 281 366: 148 n. 22  
 p. 657. 31 + 34–7: 297 382–3: 112  
 NOVIUS 491: 214, 313  
*Atell.* 603: 175–6 n. 14, 207  
 87: 290 757–8: 86 n. 52  
 839–40: 115–16, 201  
 OVID *Aul.*  
*ars* 56–9: 174–5  
 317–18: 49 n. 49 61–3: 251  
*epist.* 90: 126–7  
 6. 6: 233 99–100: 110–11  
*met.* 193–4: 42  
 2. 301–3: 49 n. 49 228–9: 207  
 230–4: 286  
 238: 240  
 257–8: 69  
 257: 201 n. 32  
 318–19: 63–4  
 340–1: 38  
 356: 39  
 426: 283–4  
 449: 39  
 492–3: 75  
 523: 72–3  
 549–50: 66  
 569–71: 48  
 584–5: 262  
 611: 203  
 620–1: 60  
 659: 39–40  
 664–6: 48  
 670–2: 250  
 686: 69–70  
 742–3: 69–70  
 776: 196–7  
 788–9: 196  
 828: 231  
 PACUVIUS  
*trag.* 30: 217  
 41–2: 283  
 81–2: 238  
 112: 218  
 116: 283  
 165: 286 n.  
 167: 157  
 219–20: 251  
 228: 283  
 236: 235  
 344: 297  
 PETRONIUS  
 95. 3: 339  
 PHOCAS  
*gramm.* v. 436. 12: 350  
 PLAUTUS  
*Amph.* 69–74: 254–5  
 205–10: 229–30  
 231–4: 8

PLAUTUS (*cont.*)*Bacch.*

90: 111  
 156–7: 282–3  
 283: 82  
 444–5: 288  
 697: 203–4, 207  
 701: 182 n. 26  
 722: 59  
 847–9: 177  
 887: 85 n. 47  
 1019–22: 82–3  
 1058: 103 n. 22  
 1153: 95  
 1157: 31

*Capt.*

167–8: 135  
 385–7: 183 n. 30  
 431: 284  
 439: 128  
 690 + 695–6: 152  
 711–12: 208  
 791: 96–7  
 947–8: 252

*Cas.*

234: 94  
 270–1: 229  
 331–2: 128  
 332: 125 n.  
 424–6: 43 n.  
 521: 94  
 530: 123  
 714: 95  
 1001: 175 n. 14

*Cist.*

235: 115  
 301: 131

*Curc.*

29: 79  
 72–3: 150  
 72: 157–8  
 143–4: 140  
 222: 61  
 244: 139  
 361: 63  
 432–3: 38  
 435: 61  
 533–9: 106–7  
 551: 65

586–7: 184

621: 139

663: 41

700: 73

*Epid.*

145: 106  
 196: 103 n. 22  
 263–4: 176  
 515: 46  
 584–5: 289–90  
 595: 115–16  
 619: 287  
 656: 180

*Men.*

277: 46  
 521: 181–2  
 528–9 + 538: 157  
 784–5: 123  
 791: 183  
 950–1: 184  
 994: 96, 122  
 1060–1: 182 n. 26

*Merc.*

113: 128  
 189: 119  
 323: 222  
 333–4: 120 n. 46  
 401–2: 280  
 484: 125  
 595–6: 231  
 613: 221

*Mil.*

298: 122 n. 50  
 1006–7: 202  
 1128: 237 n. 21  
 1333–4: 115–16  
 1368: 125

*Most.*

35: 109 n.  
 326–7: 121  
 633: 135–6  
 886a–7: 106  
 1025: 119  
 1162–3: 234

*Persa*

51: 93  
 207: 113 n. 40  
 389: 122, 125  
 816–17: 282

- Poen.*  
 25–7: 206  
 117: 123  
 371–2: 186  
 553: 205  
 799: 103 n. 25  
 863: 249–50  
 950–3: 221  
 1038: 85  
 1165: 140
- Pseud.*  
 298: 120 n. 46  
 307: 95  
 633: 234  
 654: 93 n. 2  
 766: 182  
 1296–7: 121
- Rud.*  
 304: 308  
 305: 218  
 376: 140, 224  
 582: 103 n. 24  
 635–8: 140–1  
 704: 127  
 731: 311  
 990–2: 110–11  
 1027–9: 201  
 1327–8: 31  
 1330–1: 131
- Stich.*  
 277: 126  
 505–7: 200  
 758–61: 9  
 767–8: 9
- Trin.*  
 40–2: 285  
 59–60: 182  
 90–3: 278  
 220–2: 204  
 369–70: 100  
 370: 106  
 436–7: 252  
 555–6: 127  
 627: 93  
 994: 252  
 1012: 113
- Truc.*  
 606: 201  
 829–30: 208
- 830: 73 n. 30
- Vid.*  
 83–7: 247–8
- Fretum:*  
 2: 175
- inc. fab.  
 fr. ii: 263
- PROPERTIUS  
 2. 23. 21–2: 218
- QUINTILIAN  
*inst.*  
 1. 5. 66: 353
- SENECA  
*epist.*  
 58. 4–5: 1, 349 n. 21
- SERVIUS  
*gramm.*  
 iv. 437. 20: 350–1
- SILIUS ITALICUS  
 10. 53–4: 344
- STATIUS  
*Theb.*  
 5. 658–60: 340
- SUETONIUS  
*Tib.*  
 67. 1: 355 n.
- TACITUS  
*ann.*  
 4. 38. 3: 355
- TERENCE  
*Ad.*  
 127: 44  
 170: 126–7  
 232–3: 43  
 299–300: 80  
 316–17: 76–7  
 368: 62  
 403: 62  
 431: 118  
 433: 118  
 458–9: 119  
 514–15: 60  
 537–8: 47  
 590–1: 46

TERENCE (*cont.*)

- 603: 41
- 638 + 641: 86
- 653-4: 65
- 770-2: 76-7
- 817-19: 40
- 842-4: 42-3

*Andr.*

- 258-9: 75-6

*Eun.*

- 35-8: 7
- 273: 114-15
- 545: 60 n. 10
- 561: 80
- 962-3: 100-1
- 1080: 111

*Haut.*

- 269-70: 84-5
- 1031: 124

*Hec.*

- 341-2: 114-15
- 607: 65-6

*Phorm.*

- 308: 185
- 419: 114
- 536-7: 219
- 768: 93 n. 4

## TITINIUS

*com.*

- 32-3: 283

## TRAGEDY

- Trag. inc.* 13-14 + 16: 156-7
- Trag. inc.* 120-2: 286
- Trag. inc.* 148: 290 n.

## TURPILIUS

*com.*

- 106-7: 281

## VIRGIL

*Aen.*

- 2. 325-6: 31
- 4. 384-6: 40 n. 28
- 10. 108: 360
- 12. 316: 340

## Index of Words

This index contains the word forms discussed in this book sorted according to language. Latin precedes all other languages. In order to distinguish between indicative and subjunctive, I have marked the quantities as they are in Plautus (*faxit* vs. *faxīt*), even where forms are only attested at a time where such distinctions no longer exist. In accordance with the conventions of this book, *i* and *u* are sometimes used instead of *y* and *w* among the reconstructed forms.

### Latin

*abfuāt* 359–60  
*abiugāssere* 224, 228  
*abiūrāssit* 341  
*accendere* 325  
*acclārāssis* 346–7  
*accrēduās* 269, 281  
*adāctum* 326  
*adāxint* 326  
*adduēs* 356–7  
*adduīt* 262–3, 356  
*adiūuerīt* 218–19  
*adiūuerō* 175 n. 12, 215–17, 324, 353  
*adiūuī* 324  
*aduenās* 264, 269, 279, 374  
*aduenāt* 197 n. 17, 273  
*adulēsceturīre* 309  
*afflixint* 322–3, 346–7  
*age* 122 n. 50  
*agō* 326  
*aiō* 350  
*amābō* 7, 34 n., 35, 350  
*amāns sīt* 307 n. 1  
*amārō* 320  
*amāss-* 349  
*amāssēm* 320, 335, 373  
*amāssēt* 321 n.  
*amāssim* 191, 320, 373  
*amāssint* 315  
*amāssīs* 319  
*amāssīs* 191, 202, 320, 374  
*amāssīt* 307 n. 1  
*amāssō* 175 n. 14, 315, 317, 320, 322, 335, 351 n. 28, 362, 373

*ambīssint* 206–7, 211, 212 n. 53, 254–5, 322  
*ambīssīt* 206–7, 211, 212 n. 53, 254–5  
*āmīsī* 323  
*āmissīs* 322–4  
*āmittō* 323  
*anhēlitus* 8  
*appellāminō* 94 n. 6  
*appellāssīs* 195, 352 n. 31  
*apstulās* 264, 269, 273  
*aspexit* 322–3  
*asserēs* 321  
*assum* 13  
*ast* 238 n. 26, 341, 342 n. 10, 354 n.  
*attigam* 4  
*attigāmus* 4  
*attigant* 4  
*attigās* 2, 4, 19, 170, 264, 266–7, 269, 272, 275, 279, 281–2, 284, 285 n. 29, 288–90, 296, 298, 306, 358, 361, 367, 371  
*attigāt* 4, 281, 283, 360 n. 52  
*attigātīs* 4, 285 n. 29, 288  
*attigerīs* 291  
*attigit* 361  
*attigistī* 296 n.  
*attigō* 361  
*attulās* 273, 290  
*attulāt* 273, 279, 283, 360 n. 51  
*au* 7  
*audibō* 33 n., 367  
*āuerruncāss-* 349  
*āuerruncāssere* 224, 226–8, 235–8  
*āuerruncāssint* 218  
*augurium* genitive 238

**Latin (cont.)**

- aus-* 349  
*ausī* 323  
*ausim* 192, 196 n. 11, 198, 200 n. 28, 202, 298, 315, 320 n. 27, 321–3, 343–5, 351–2, 362–3, 374  
*ausīt* 207, 344  
*auxīs* 346–7  
*auxītis* 322–3, 346–7  
*āx-* 349  
*āxim* 326, 363  
*baes-* 349  
*baeīs* 352  
*boāre* 8  
*caedō* 325  
*cantica* 9  
*caperāssere* 224, 228, 232 n. 15  
*capessō* 309–10  
*capiō* 326  
*caps-* 349  
*capsim* 216  
*capsimus* 308  
*capsīs* 220, 353  
*capsit* unclear mood 191 n. 2  
*capsīt* 326  
*capsīt* 278 n. 17  
*capsō* 19, 21, 216–17, 307, 309–10, 315–17, 341  
*cāssus* 316  
*cauē* 93, 95, 119–32, 205–6, 210–11, 220, 284–5, 291–3  
*cauneās* 95 n. 8  
†*cauō†* 297  
*caussa* 317 n. 22, 321  
*cecīdī* 325  
*cēdō* 350  
*cēlāss-* 349  
*cēnātī* 308  
*cēpī* 326  
*cīsiūm* 317 n. 20  
*claudere* 317 n. 21  
*clepsit* 322–3, 341–2  
*concha* 127 n. 59  
*concinuī* 249 n.  
*concrēduī* 249, 260 n., 357  
*concrēduō* 209 n. 48, 241, 249, 261–2  
*concupere* 121 n. 49  
*cōnfore* 272, 276  
*cōnsilium* genitive 238  
*cooptāssint* 341  
*creāssit* 320–1, 341  
*crēduam* 282 n. 25  
*crēduās* 264, 269, 275, 334, 358, 360  
*crēduāt* 281  
*crēduīs* 249, 253–4, 328  
*crēduīt* 249, 250 n.  
*cūrāssint* 206  
*cūrāssīs* 201, 205  
*dacrima* 357 n. 44  
*dāmus* 333–4  
*dare* 328, 332–3  
*dās* 269, 280, 288, 296, 333–4  
*dāte* 333–4  
*dātīs* 333–4  
*deargentāssere* 224–6, 230, 311 n.  
*dēcrērō* 320  
*dederim* 256, 291  
*dederītīs* 253–4  
*dēfexit* 341  
*dēfuās* 269  
*dēfuāt* 271, 275  
*dēlēberit* 326  
*dēlēre* 326  
*dēlēssit* 326  
*dēlēuerit* 326  
*dēlēuī* 326  
*dēlinere* 326  
*dēlīnsit* 327  
*dēlīs-* 349  
*dēlīsīt* 326–7  
*dēlītus* 327  
*dem* 327–8, 330–1, 333–5  
*dēmus* 331, 333–4  
*dēmūtāssīs* 248  
*dēnāsāre* 311  
*dēpōclāssere* 224–7, 230  
*dērupsīt* 352 n. 35  
*dēs* 333  
*dēspectulāssere* 224–6, 230  
*dēsquāmāre* 311  
*dēt* 333  
*dēuerbia* 9  
*deus* 331 n.  
*dicāss-* 349  
*dictum* 323  
*dīlapidāss-* 349  
*dīrrumpātīs* 213  
*dīuus* 331 n.

- dīxem* 320, 335, 373  
*dīxēs* 322–3  
*dīxī* 323  
*dīxim* 320–1, 323, 373  
*dīxīs* 201, 205, 248  
*dīxō* 320–1, 335  
*dīxtī* 320  
*dō* 334  
*du-* 264, 269, 295  
*duam* 240  
*duās* 240  
*duem* 357  
*duent* 357  
*duere* 357  
*duerit* 357–8  
*duēt* 357–8  
*duim* 2, 4, 170, 240–2, 248–51, 255–6, 260, 265, 327–31, 333–5, 367  
*duīmus* 4, 241, 331, 333  
*duint* 4, 207, 241, 245, 252, 254–5, 355–7  
*duīs* 354, 356  
*duīs* 4, 19, 92, 203, 221 n. 65, 240–1, 247–8, 251–3, 296–7, 354, 356, 371, 374  
*duīt* 261–3, 356–8, 367  
*duīt* 4, 240, 250 n., 251, 253 n., 355, 357, 363  
*duītis* 4, 241  
*duītur* 241, 248, 250  
*duunt* 357  
*effectum* 327  
*effexis* 178, 324, 327  
*ēgī* 326  
*ei* interjection 7  
*em* 122 n. 50  
*ēmēre* 325  
*ēmī* 325  
*emō* 325  
*empsim* 325  
*ēptum* 325  
*enim* 339  
*erit* 308 n. 6  
*esed* 308 n. 6  
*esse* 289 n. 32  
*est* 26  
*ēsūrīre* 309  
*ēuenās* 269  
*ēuenāt* 274, 279, 282 n. 24, 285, 360 nn. 51–2  
*excantāss-* 349  
*excēdō* 323  
*excessī* 323  
*excessīs* 195, 322–4  
*exclūdere* 317 n. 21  
*excussīs* 322  
*exdorsuāre* 311  
*exoculāre* 311  
*exoculāssitis* 311, 322 n. 30  
*exossāre* 311  
*explōdere* 317 n. 21  
*exstinguō* 323  
*exstīnxī* 323  
*exstīnxīt* 322–3  
*extum* genitive 238  
*facere* 328 n. 43  
*facessō* 309–10  
*faciēs sīt* 307 n. 1  
*factitāre* 322 n. 29  
*factū* 322 n. 29  
*factum* 322 n. 29  
*factūrus* 322 n. 29  
*fax-* 349  
*faxim* 4, 170–1, 191–3, 199–200, 202–4, 207, 209, 210 n., 214–16, 223, 255, 260, 278 n. 21, 306, 308–9, 313–14, 317 n. 22, 321, 327, 346–8, 367, 374  
*faxīmus* 4  
*faxīmus* 4, 207  
*faxint* indicative 4  
*faxint* subjunctive 4, 194–7, 201 n. 32, 204, 209 n. 48, 247–8, 315, 337, 346  
*faxis* 4, 169, 178, 180, 188, 341, 349 n. 22, 350–1  
*faxīs* 4, 19, 191, 193, 198, 201–2, 205–6, 209, 213, 248, 297, 308, 346, 348, 352  
*faxit* unclear mood 191 n. 2  
*faxit* 4, 171, 173, 178, 188, 262, 308 n. 5, 322, 327  
*faxīt* 4, 96, 196, 201, 203, 207, 213 n., 307 n. 1  
*faxītis* 4, 178  
*faxītis* 4  
*faxō* 2, 4, 19, 21, 24, 169–75, 177–90, 196 n. 11, 199, 215–16, 223–4, 287, 297–8, 305–12, 314, 317 n. 22, 321, 324, 326, 335, 337–40, 344, 348–51, 362–4, 370–4  
*fēcerim* 314

**Latin (cont.)**

- fēcerimus* 219  
*fēcerimus* 219  
*fēcerō* 314  
*fēcī* 307, 309, 314, 324 n. 35  
*fēlāre* 319, 332 n. 50  
*fellāre* 319  
*fēriae* 215  
*fēstus* 215  
*fieri* 289 n. 32  
*filius* 332 n. 50  
*flāuus* 330  
*flōrus* 330  
*fore* 144 n. 18, 361  
*forēt* 1–2  
*forsitan* 183 n. 33, 359  
*fortūnāss-* 349  
*fu-* 264–5, 271, 289 n. 32, 295  
*fuam* 279, 283, 358, 360 n. 52  
*fuant* 197 n. 17, 267, 285 n. 27, 287, 358–60  
*fuās* 93, 264, 269, 279, 283–4, 286, 288, 290 n., 296 n., 360 n. 51, 361, 367  
*fuāt* 271, 275, 279–84, 286–90, 292, 295, 337, 358–61, 363–4, 374  
*fueris* 291  
*fui* 26, 289 n. 32  
*fūimus* 296 n.  
*fuistī* 296 n.  
*fuit* 296 n.  
*fuō* 361  
*gnārus* 319  
*gnāuus* 330  
*gnōscō* 330  
*habēssīt* 346–7  
*habunt* 232  
*horriferum* genitive 238  
*iēcī* 324 n. 35  
*immūtāssīs* 205, 262  
*imperāssīt* 341  
*impetrāssere* 4, 13, 20, 133, 170–1, 224, 227, 229, 237 n. 21, 306, 370–1  
*impetrāssim* 170–1, 367  
*impetrāssimus* 309 n. 11  
*impetrāssō* 170–1, 310, 348, 367  
*incantāssīt* 228  
*incēnātī* 308 n. 7  
*incendere* 325  
*incēns-* 349  
*incēnsit* 325  
*incipissimus* 309 n. 11  
*incipissō* 309  
*indicāssīs* 201  
*indicāssō* 307  
*indūcō* 323  
*inductum* 323  
*indūxī* 323  
*indūxīs* 322–3  
*infīt* 350  
*inquam* 350  
*inquināuerit* 326  
*insex-* 349  
*īnsexit* 322–3  
*interdare* 328–9  
*interduim* 244, 252, 261, 263, 328–9, 334  
*interduō* 5, 241, 244 n. 8, 249, 261, 263, 296, 329, 356  
*inuolāssīt* 238 n. 26, 342–3, 348  
*iubeō* 323  
*Iouipiter* 318  
*iouī* 323  
*ioussit* 323  
*irrogāssīt* 341  
*irrūgāssere* 224, 228  
*-issimus* 318  
*iubeō* 323  
*iūdicāssīt* 315, 341  
*Iūpiter* 318–19  
*Iuppiter* 318–19  
*iūrāssīt* 315, 341  
*iuss-* 349  
*iussit* sigmatic future 1, 262, 341–2  
*iussō* 1, 322–3, 341, 351, 367  
*iussum* 323  
*iūuerint* 216, 218, 363  
*iūuerīt* 219  
*iūuerō* 324–5  
*iūuī* 324  
*kadamitās* 357 n. 44  
*lacrima* 357 n. 44  
*lēgāss-* 349  
*lēgāssīt* 171  
*leitera* 318  
*leuāss-* 349  
*leuāssō* 175 n. 12, 217  
*licēssīt* 175–6 n. 14, 199 n., 207  
*licēt* 197 n. 15

- līmāss-* 349  
*lingua* 357 n. 44  
*lītera* 318  
*littera* 318  
*locāssim* 197  
*locāssint* 341  
*loquier* 1–2  
*luere* 357 n. 44  
*mactāss-* 349  
*mactāssint* 346–7  
*manū* 332 n. 49  
*medius* 328 n. 44  
*mercāssitur* 315  
*migrāssit* 341  
*monēre* 324 n. 37  
*monerint* 200 n. 26, 215–18, 315–17,  
 324, 353, 363  
*moneris* 217, 319, 324, 327  
*monuī* 324  
*mūtātis modis cantica* 10  
*narrō* 319  
*nāuus* 330  
*negāssim* 307  
*nequīre* 44  
*nocēre* 324 n. 37  
*nocuī* 324  
*noenu* 303  
*nōscō* 330  
*nox-* 349  
*noxīt* 201 n. 33, 324–5, 348, 352 n.  
 31  
*nucifrangibula* 198  
*nummum* genitive 238  
*nuncupāss-* 349  
*obiexim* 324  
*obiexis* 324  
*occentāssere* 224  
*occepsō* 175 n. 14, 254, 326  
*occīdī* 325  
*occīs-* 349  
*occīsīt* 170, 173, 320 n. 27, 325  
*occīsūrum* uninflected infinitive 154 n.  
 31  
*occultāssis* 93  
*octāuus* 330  
*octō* 330  
*oppugnāssere* 224, 227, 229–30  
*Pāniceī* 226  
*parcuīt* 249  
*parī* 113 n. 40  
*pāricīdās* 261  
*parricīda* 261 n.  
*parseris* 260 n.  
*parsī* 260 n., 313 n.  
*parsis* 205, 215, 260 n., 313, 322–3  
*parsīt* 249  
*patricīda* 261 n.  
*pauōs* 238  
*pepercī* 313 n., 322 n. 31  
*pepercīt* 249  
*perduim* 250  
*perduint* 196, 241, 249–50, 354–6, 364,  
 367  
*perduīt* 363  
*perpetuāss-* 349  
*perpetuāssint* 352 n. 31  
*peruenant* 278  
*peruenās* 269  
*peruentūrum esse* uninflected infinitive  
 154 n. 31  
*pessimus* 318 n. 23  
*petessō* 309  
*plaudere* 317 n. 21  
*plōdere* 317 n. 21  
*plōrāss-* 349  
*plōrāssīt* 175 n. 12, 223  
*portentum* genitive 238  
*possitum* 316–17 n. 19  
*potēns* 271  
*potesse* 271  
*potis fuī* 271–2  
*potuī* 271  
*praefiscinī* 214, 313  
*prōcessūrum esse* uninflected infinitive  
 154 n. 31  
*prōdigium* genitive 238  
*prōduīt* 356  
*prōfuit* 296 n.  
*prohibēss-* 349  
*prohibēsseis* 94 n. 7  
*prohibēssint* 342  
*prohibēssīs* 198, 200 n. 29, 203, 211 n.  
 50, 221 n. 65, 251, 315, 320, 322,  
 348  
*prohibēssīt* 317, 326, 341–2  
*prohibēssīt* 347  
*prohibuissēs* 320  
*propriāss-* 349

**Latin (cont.)**

*prōscrīpturīt* 309 n. 12  
*prō ssummā* 316 n. 18  
*quaesō* 7, 109 n. 33, 350  
*quīre* 44  
*rapsit* 324–5, 341–2  
*rapuī* 324  
*rāuus* 330  
*receptō* 341  
*reconciliāssere* 135–6, 224, 227  
*reconciliāssō* 227 n. 7  
*reddō* 333–4  
*rediēmus* 232  
*respexis* 174–5, 178  
*respōnsīs* 201–2  
*rogāssit* 341  
*rosa* 316  
*rumpō* 321  
*rūpī* 324 n. 35  
*rups-* 349  
*rupsit* 175 n. 12, 321–2, 324  
*serps-* 349  
*serpsit* 322–3  
*seruāre* 332 n. 51  
*seruāssint* 200  
*seruāssīs* 198, 221 n. 65, 251  
*sīrint* 216–21, 319, 324–5, 353  
*sīrīs* 203, 215–16, 220–2, 251, 259 n.,  
 353, 363  
*sīrītis* 221  
*sīs* ‘please’ 109–10  
*sīuerint* 353  
*sīuī* 324  
*sōdēs* 109–10  
*sorbuī* 324 n. 36  
*sorpsī* 324 n. 36  
*spōns-* 349  
*spōnsīs* 325, 352 n. 32  
*spopondī* 325  
*sternere* 332  
*sternimus* 332 n. 52  
*struere* 332  
*struimus* 332 n. 53  
*sullāturīt* 309 n. 12  
*suremps-* 349  
*surempsīt* 325  
*surrepsīt* 325, 342  
*tag-* 264–5, 272, 295  
*tagam* 272, 279, 297, 325 n. 39, 361

*tagīt* 297, 361–2  
*tagō* 279, 296–7  
*tāx-* 349  
*tāxīs* 325, 346–7  
*tetigī* 325  
*tul-* 264–5, 273, 275, 295  
*tulāt* 273, 276, 279, 286  
*turbāssitur* 341  
*turpāss-* 349  
*uen-* 264–5, 273, 275, 295  
*uerberīt* 175 n. 12, 223  
*[u]īcītūrum* 148 n. 23  
*uīderō* 216  
*ulcīscerem* 326  
*ulcīscī* 326  
*uls-* 349  
*ulsō* 326  
*ultus* 326

**English**

*-est* 311 n.  
*-eth* 311 n.  
*is* 26  
*I think* 184 n.  
*methinks* 184 n.  
*tear* noun 357 n. 44  
*thou* 311 n.  
*tongue* 357 n. 44

**Faliscan**

*douiad* 331  
*foied* 317 n. 21

**French**

*aller* 33  
*va mourir* 33

**German**

*Zähre* 357 n. 44  
*Zunge* 357 n. 44

**Gothic**

*ahtau* 330 n. 46  
*ahtuda* 330 n. 46

## Greek

ἀποζεῦξαι 228  
 γέγονα 309 n. 9  
 δάκρυ 357 n. 44  
 δίδωμι 241, 328, 333  
 ἔδωκα 328 n. 42, 333  
 ἔθηκα 307, 324 n. 35  
 εἶ 26  
 ἔλθοι 102–3  
 ἔπεισα 307  
 ἔπιθον 307  
 ἐσσί 26  
 ἐστί 26  
 εὔρετής 197 n. 15  
 ἔφυν 26  
 ἦκα 324 n. 35  
 ἦσθα 26  
 κτάνητε 102–3  
 μή 103, 115 n. 42  
 ὄρεῖ νιφόνεντι 238 n. 26  
 πεισόμεθα 309  
 πέπεισμαι 33 n.  
 πέπονθα 33 n.  
 πηρός 261 n.  
 ποιήσης 115 n. 42  
 προσέλθης 352  
 τίθημι 241, 328  
 -φι 238 n. 26

## Hernican (Possibly a Form of Oscan)

*hvidas* 280

## Indo-European and Other Reconstructed Forms

\**amā-s-e-s* 319  
 \**amāsō* 316, 318  
 \**attetigistī* 296 n.  
 \**attigere* 296–7  
 \**attigis* 296  
 \**b<sup>h</sup>leH<sub>3</sub>-* 330  
 \**b<sup>h</sup>uH<sub>x</sub>-* 26, 144 n. 18, 264 n. 2  
 \**b<sup>h</sup>weH<sub>2</sub>-* 289 n. 32  
 \**dāwīm* 329–30  
 \**dāwīm* 329  
 \**dayēm* 330–1  
 \**dāyēt* 333

\**deH<sub>3</sub>-* 241, 264 n. 2, 269–70, 327–9, 331–5  
 \**deH<sub>3</sub>-iH<sub>1</sub>-m* 329  
 \**deH<sub>3</sub>-s* 333 n. 54  
 \**deH<sub>3</sub>-syé-ti* 308  
 \**deH<sub>3</sub>-w-* 332  
 \**deH<sub>3</sub>-yeH<sub>1</sub>-m* 329  
 \**dēlē-s-e-t* 326  
 \**dēm* 331  
 \**dengua* 357 n. 44  
 \**dew-* 331–2  
 \**dewH<sub>x</sub>-* 331–4  
 \**deyk-* 314  
 \**deyk-e/o-* 314  
 \**deyk-s-* 314  
 \**dēyk-s-* 314  
 \**deyk-s-iH<sub>1</sub>-mos* 314  
 \**deyk-* 321  
 \**deyk-e/o-* 321  
 \**deyk-s-īm* 321  
 \**deyk-s-ō* 321  
 \**deyk-s-stay* 320 n. 26  
 \**deywāseti* 319  
 \**deywos* 331 n.  
 \**dH-iH-me* 330–1  
 \**dH-te* 333  
 \**dH-yeH-m* 330–1  
 \**dH<sub>3</sub>-iH<sub>1</sub>-m* 329–30  
 \**dH<sub>3</sub>-tes* 333 n. 54  
 \**dH<sub>3</sub>-yeH<sub>1</sub>-m* 329  
 \**dH<sub>3</sub>-yeH<sub>1</sub>-t* 333  
 \**di-d-ā-t* 333  
 \**dō-* 330–1  
 \**dō-ī-mos* 331  
 \**dōs* 333 n. 54  
 \**dōw-* 331  
 \**dōw-* 331  
 \**dō-yelo-* 331  
 \**duH<sub>3</sub>-iH<sub>1</sub>-mos* 333  
 \**d<sup>h</sup>eH<sub>1</sub>-* 241, 264 n. 2, 269–70, 328–9, 334  
 \**d<sup>h</sup>eH<sub>1</sub>-i-* 332 n. 50  
 \**d<sup>h</sup>eH<sub>1</sub>-k-* 307, 314, 324 n. 35, 328 n. 43  
 \**d<sup>h</sup>H<sub>1</sub>i-* 332 n. 50  
 \**d<sup>h</sup>H<sub>1</sub>k-s-* 314  
 \**d<sup>h</sup>H<sub>1</sub>k-s-i(e)H<sub>1</sub>-m* 308  
 \**d<sup>h</sup>H<sub>1</sub>k-s-oH<sub>1</sub>* 307  
 \**d<sup>h</sup>H<sub>1</sub>k-ye/o-* 314  
 \**d<sup>h</sup>iH<sub>1</sub>-* 332 n. 50

**Indo-European (cont.)**

\*(e-)dō-m 331  
 \*fak-yelo- 321  
 \*faxere 297  
 \*fūuerint 216  
 \*g<sup>ne</sup>H<sub>3</sub>- 330  
 \*g<sup>h</sup>reH<sub>3</sub>- 330  
 \*g<sup>w</sup>em- 264 n. 2  
 \*HyeH<sub>1</sub>-k- 324 n. 35  
 \*H<sub>1</sub>e-H<sub>1</sub>es-s 26  
 \*H<sub>1</sub>e-H<sub>1</sub>m-ēri 325  
 \*H<sub>1</sub>es- 26, 289 n. 32  
 \*H<sub>1</sub>es-e-t 308 n. 6  
 \*H<sub>1</sub>es-(s)i 26  
 \*H<sub>3</sub>oktoH<sub>3</sub>-o-s 330  
 \*H<sub>3</sub>oktoH<sub>3</sub>w 330  
 \*H<sub>3</sub>oktoH<sub>3</sub>-wo-s 330  
 \*H<sub>3</sub>oktoH<sub>3</sub>w-o-s 330  
 \*-iH<sub>1</sub>- 329  
 \*iuua-s-ō 216  
 \*kad-tos 316  
 \*kon-kekinī 249 n.  
 \*k<sup>w</sup>i-k<sup>w</sup>it-se-ti 309  
 \*manūd 332 n. 49  
 \*med<sup>h</sup>yo- 328 n. 44  
 \*mone-s-e-s 319, 324  
 \*mone-s-ī-(e)nt 216  
 \*mone-to- 324  
 \*mone-w-ay 324  
 \*mone-ye/o- 324  
 \*noke-s-ī-t 324  
 \*noke-to- 324  
 \*noke-w-ay 324  
 \*noke-yelo- 324  
 \*oktōu 330  
 \*pāsokaidās 261 n.  
 \*pend<sup>h</sup>-so-med<sup>h</sup>H<sub>2</sub> 309  
 \*potēre 271  
 \*prohibēsīt 317  
 \*prohibēzīt 317  
 \*provātom 318  
 \*rap-e/o- 324  
 \*rape-s-e-t 324  
 \*rape-w-ay 324  
 \*rap-to- 324  
 \*re-didō 333-4  
 \*ret-s-ti 309  
 \*rewp- 324 n. 35  
 \*saturīre 309 n. 12

\*sei-s-ī-(e)nt 216  
 \*sei-s-īs 220  
 \*sei-u-is-īs 220  
 \*ser- 332 n. 51  
 \*seys-iH<sub>1</sub>-(e)nt 319, 324  
 \*sey-w-ay 324  
 \*sniphowenti 238 n. 26  
 \*-stay 320 n. 26  
 \*ster- 332  
 \*sterH<sub>3</sub>- 332  
 \*ster-n-H<sub>3</sub>-mos 332 n. 52  
 \*strew- 332  
 \*strew-o-mos 332 n. 53  
 \*-tay 320 n. 26  
 \*teH<sub>2</sub>g- 264 n. 2  
 \*telH<sub>2</sub>- 264 n. 2  
 \*termnātom (fefakom) 318  
 \*uerbere 223  
 \*uerbeset 223  
 \*uerbesi 223  
 \*uerbesit 223  
 \*-yeH<sub>1</sub>- 329  
 \*yowd<sup>h</sup>-eye-ti 323 n. 33  
 \*yuwa-s-ō 324  
 \*yuwa-w-ay 324

**Italian**

futuro 155 n. 33

**Lithuanian**

dúosiu 26 n.

**Ngiyampaa**

kampirra 27 n. 11

**Old Irish**

beraid 306  
 ·bera 306  
 reiss 309

**Oscan**

deicum 142 n. 14  
 deiuastr 319  
 didest 333  
 fusid 319  
 fust 308

mefiaí 328 n. 44  
 patensíns 319  
 prúfattens 318  
 termnattom 318

### Sanskrit

ádāt 333  
 ad<sup>h</sup>āt 307, 324 n. 35  
 asat 308 n. 6  
 asati 308 n. 6  
 aṣṭā 330 n. 46  
 aṣṭāu 330 n. 46  
 cīkītsati 309  
 dadāmi 241, 328, 333  
 dad<sup>h</sup>āmi 241, 328  
 dāsyāmi 26 n.  
 dāsyāti 308  
 dvā 330 n. 46  
 dvāu 330 n. 46

jagāna 309 n. 9  
 mad<sup>h</sup>ya- 328 n. 44  
 yōd<sup>h</sup>āyati 323 n. 33

### Spanish

Conchita 127 n. 59

### Umbrian

dirsa 333  
 erom ehiato 142 n. 16  
 fust 308  
 mani 332 n. 49  
 purditom 332  
 purdouitu 329

### Venetic

vha.g.s.to 305–6, 314

## General Index

- Ablaut* 307
- accent in Vedic Sanskrit 188
- accommodation 197
- accusative and infinitive, *see* AcI
- AcI 133–62, 229–30; *see also* NcI
- absence of subject accusatives, register 150–2
- classical tense usage 134–5
- Osco-Umbrian 134
- present for future, classical period 164–5
- present for future, diachronic decline 161–2
- present for future, register 154–8
- sigmatic infinitives 229–30
- Subject-to-Object Raising 134
- tense and absence of subject accusatives 152–4
- tense and governing verb 158–60
- tense and subject of the infinitive 144–6
- tense and telicity 137–44
- tense and voice 148–9
- tenses of *dare* 146–8
- adhortative subjunctive, *see* modality
- ā*-forms, *see also* *ā*-subjunctives
- Balto-Slavic 306
- Hernican 280
- Old Irish subjunctive 306
- Tocharian 306
- Aktionsart*, *see* telicity
- ambiguity
- between main and subordinate clauses 99–102, 186, 204–5, 210, 256, 284–5
- between wishes and prohibitions 102–3, 249, 256, 281
- aurist
- modal 313
- perfect infinitive as aurist 231–2
- perfect subjunctive as aurist 95–7, 118, 214–15
- root aurist 307, 324–5, 328
- sigmatic aurist 306–14, 322, 324–5
- Apuleius, *see* style
- archaisms
- false 237–8, 263, 342 n. 10, 343
- learnt at school 1
- aspect, *see* tense and aspect
- assimilation 13, 315, 318 n. 23, 320 n. 27
- ā*-subjunctives 264–96, 306, 358–62; *see also* *ā*-forms
- after 100BC 358–62
- auxiliaries 287
- corresponding indicatives 296–7
- distribution over main clause types 291–3
- distribution over subordinate clause types 293–4
- function like *ī*-subjunctives 266
- going back to preventives 279–80, 291
- Hernican 280
- inhibitive and preventive 288–90
- origins 306
- politeness in directives 290
- preference for main clauses 266–8
- productivity according to roots and verbs 269–74
- productivity compared to regular subjunctives 265
- prohibitions 294–5
- register 277–9
- roots in Indo-European 264 n. 2
- roots in Latin 264
- survival in Terence 275–7
- tense and aspect 279–90
- verbs with *ā*-subjunctives 264–5
- verbs without *ā*-subjunctives 269–77
- Balto-Slavic
- ā*-forms 306
- s*-future 308–9
- brevis breuiāns*, *see* iambic shortening

- cantica, *see* register  
 Cato, *see* style  
 causative, *see also* sigmatic futures  
     Indo-European 323 n. 33, 324 n. 37  
 Celtic *s*-future 308  
 character types, *see* register  
 commands  
     absence of *ā*-subjunctives 292  
     future imperative for contingent events 111–12  
     periphrastic 97–8  
     rarity of *ī*-subjunctives 256–7  
     rarity of sigmatic subjunctives 210–11  
 conditional clauses 78–9, 179, 211–12  
 conjunction reduction 136  
*cōnsecūtiō temporum*, *see* sequence of tenses  
  
 deliberative subjunctive, *see* modality  
 deponents 41 n. 31, 326  
     semi-deponents 41 n. 31, 323  
 desiderative  
     Indo-Iranian 309  
     Latin (-*essō* / -*issō*) 309–10  
     Latin sigmatic infinitive 227  
     Latin (-*urīre*) 309  
 Dinia 198 n. 19, 247–8  
 directive expressions, *see* commands;  
     prohibitions with *cauē*;  
     prohibitions with *nē*; prohibition types  
 distribution  
     *ā*-subjunctives, clause types 291–4  
     *ā*-subjunctives, main and subordinate clauses 266–8  
     cantica and senarii, *see* register  
     general 6  
     *ī*-subjunctives, clause types 256–8  
     *ī*-subjunctives, main and subordinate clauses 242–4  
     second and third persons in directives 104–5  
     sigmatic futures, main and subordinate clauses 172–3  
     sigmatic futures, subordinate clause types 172–4, 179  
     sigmatic subjunctives, clause types 210–12  
     sigmatic subjunctives, main and subordinate clauses 192–3  
     simple future and future perfect 34, 36–7  
     telic and atelic infinitives, *see* Acl  
*du*-  
     originally two roots 241, 328  
     same as *dare* 240  
     spread of -*u*- 328–9  
 Dutch word order 188  
  
*ē*-forms 356–7  
 elision 13  
 enclitic pronouns 200 n. 30  
 English  
     future 33  
     progressive 25  
 Euclio 178, 196–7, 247–8  
 Eunus, C. Novius 316–17 n. 19  
 expressive gemination 318  
  
 Faliscan *f* > *h* 317 n. 21  
 false archaisms  
     Cicero 238 n. 26, 342 n. 10  
     curse tablet 343  
     Homer 238 n. 26  
     *interduō* etc. as presents 263  
     Pacuvius 237–8  
*faxō*, *see* sigmatic futures  
 fragments problematic as evidence 13  
 French future 33  
 frequentative 322 n. 29  
  
 Gaulish loanwords 317 n. 20  
 geminates  
     pronounced 315–21  
     -ss- 315–21  
     written 315–17, 320–1  
 German word order 188  
 grammarians 11, 23, 337, 348–53, 356–7, 360–2  
 grammaticalization, *see* reanalysis  
 Grecism 232  
 Greek  
     medio-passive 33 n.  
     perfect 33 n.  
     *s*-future 308–9

- haplology 320  
 'hedge', *see* 'weaker'  
 Hernican 280  
 hypercorrection  
   in Jumaytepeque Xinka 238 n. 26  
   in Latin 317
- iambic shortening 13–14  
 imperative, *see* commands; prohibitions  
   with *nē*  
 Indo-European  
   aspect 26  
   causative 323 n. 33, 324 n. 37  
   nasal-infix present 321  
   reduplicating present 328, 333  
   root aorist 307, 324–5, 328  
   sigmatic aorist 306–14, 322, 324–5  
   verbal noun 141  
   -*ye/o*-present 321  
 Indo-Iranian  
   desiderative 309  
   *s*-future 308  
*infectum* 21–3, 28  
 injunctive 136 n. 8  
*irrealis*, *see* unreal subjunctive  
*ī*-subjunctives 240–61, 327–34, 354–8  
   after 100BC 354–8  
   corresponding indicatives 261–3  
   distribution over main clause  
     types 256–7  
   distribution over subordinate clause  
     types 257–8  
   inhibitive and preventive 253  
   origins 327–34  
*perfectum* 248–9, 259–60  
   politeness in directives 253–4  
   preference for main clauses 242–4  
   productivity according to verbs  
     244–5  
   productivity compared to regular  
     forms 241–2  
   prohibitions 259  
   register 246–8  
   survival in Terence 245  
   tense and aspect 248–55  
   verbs with *ī*-subjunctives 242  
   verbs without *ī*-subjunctives 245–6  
 Italo-Celtic 306
- Jumaytepeque Xinka 238 n. 26  
 jussive subjunctive, *see* modality
- Lachmann's law 325–6  
 laryngeals 307 n. 4, 329–32  
*lātrīna*-rule 320  
 law of Hermann and Lachmann 232 n. 15  
 legal language, *see* style  
 Lithuanian *s*-future 26 n.; *see also*  
   Balto-Slavic  
*littera*-rule 318–20  
 Livy, *see* style  
 loanwords 317 n. 20
- markedness 36  
 Medus 235  
 metathesis 332  
 metre  
   iambic shortening 13–14  
   influence on register 8–11,  
     106, 125–6, 151, 156, 176–8,  
     186–7, 195, 197, 226, 246–7,  
     277, 279  
   influence on tense choice 34–5, 45  
   law of Hermann and Lachmann  
     232 n. 15  
   scansion of *cauē*, *cauē*, *cau'* 95 n. 8  
   split resolution 200 n. 30  
 middle, *see* deponents  
 Middle Welsh *h*-subjunctive 306  
 modality  
   epistemic 232–3  
   deontic ('adhortative', 'deliberative',  
     'jussive') 118  
   root modality 231  
 monophthongization 318  
 mood, *see* injunctive; preventive (modal  
   category); subjunctive  
 morphology  
   change 1–2  
   syncretism 313, 374
- Ncl 233–4; *see also* *AcI*  
 Ngiyampaa 27 n. 11  
 nominative and infinitive, *see* Ncl  
 nonce-formations 311, 322 n. 30  
 Novius Eunus, C. 316–17 n. 19

- Old Irish  
   *ā*-subjunctive 306  
   *s*-future 308–9
- Oscan, *see also* Osco-Umbrian  
   prohibitions 97 n. 11  
   *tt*-perfect 318–19
- Osco-Umbrian  
   AcI 134  
   *ā*-subjunctive 280  
   future infinitive 142  
   *s*-future 308–9, 319
- Osthoff's law 4 n. 4, 220 n. 62
- Pacuvius' Medus 235
- past tense  
   absence of extra-paradigmatic past forms 374  
   backshift of tenses 53, 60–2  
   followed by primary sequence of tenses 65–7  
   historic present 63–4  
   perfect as non-past 64–5  
   perfect subjunctive originally non-past 214–15  
   prohibitive perfect subjunctive = synchronic anomaly 95–7, 118  
   secondary sequence of tenses 53, 60–2
- perfect formations  
   reduplication 325  
   syncretism of perfect and aorist 313  
   *-tt-* (Oscan) 318–19  
   *-u/w-* 324, 330  
   *-u/w-* next to older perfects 249
- perfectum* 21–3, 28, 30–2, 95–6, 199–200, 214–16, 248–50, 255, 260–1, 372
- phonological processes  
   assimilation 13, 315, 318 n. 23, 320 n. 27  
   elision 13  
   expressive gemination 318  
   *f > h* (Faliscan) 317 n. 21  
   haplology 320  
   hypercorrection 317  
   iambic shortening 13–14  
   Lachmann's law 325–6  
   *lātrīna*-rule 320  
   *littera*-rule 318–20  
   metathesis 332  
   monophthongization 318  
   Osthoff's law 4 n. 4, 220 n. 62  
   rhotacism 315–16, 319, 326–7  
   *sandhi* 13  
   syncope 333–4  
   vowel lengthening before *-nks-* 323  
   vowel lengthening before *-ns-* 325  
   vowel shortening in final syllables 4 n. 3, 14
- Pliny the Elder, *see* style
- pluperfect, short forms 320
- plūrālis maiestātis* 104–5
- politeness  
   *cauē* 126–7  
   *nōlī* 95 n. 9  
   present vs. perfect  
     prohibitions 108–11  
   principles 107–8  
   prohibitions with *ā*-subjunctives 290  
   prohibitions with *ī*-subjunctives 253–4  
   prohibitions with sigmatic subjunctives 201–2
- posse*  
   with aoristic perfect infinitive 231–2  
   with Ncl 232–4  
   with present infinitive 231  
   with resultative perfect infinitive 231–2  
   with sigmatic infinitive 235–6  
   with *ut* (*nē*) 234
- prayer formulae, *see* style
- present formations  
   nasal infix 321  
   reduplicating 328, 333  
   *-ye/o-* 321
- preventive (modal category) 279–80, 291, 305–6
- productivity  
   *ā*-subjunctives 265, 269–74  
   general 6  
   *ī*-subjunctives 241–6  
   sigmatic futures 178–80, 187  
   sigmatic infinitives 224–5  
   sigmatic subjunctives 191–5
- prohibitions with *cauē*  
   *ā*-subjunctives 291–5  
   grammaticalization 122–5

- prohibitions with *cauē* (*cont.*)  
*nē* often absent 120–1  
 inhibitive and preventive 128–9  
 other forms of *cauēre* 119–20  
 present and perfect 121–2  
 register 125–6  
 sigmatic subjunctives 210–11, 213  
 with first and third persons 121, 124
- prohibitions with *nē*  
 ambiguous with other clause  
   types 99–103  
 aspectual features 105  
*ā*-subjunctives 291–5  
*ī*-subjunctives 256–7, 259  
*nē fac* = inhibitive 104, 113  
 perfect subjunctive = synchronic  
   anomaly 95–7, 118  
 register 106–7  
 restrictions of the perfect  
   subjunctive 104, 118  
 second and third persons 104–5  
 sigmatic subjunctives 210–11, 213  
 time sphere 111–17  
 with *uelle* and perfect infinitive 96 n.
- prohibition types 92–5  
 periphrastic 97–8  
 with *nōlle* 97–8
- Proto-Italic  
 family tree 12  
 verbal noun 141
- pseudo-final clauses 83–6, 101
- pseudo-purpose satellites, *see*  
 pseudo-final clauses
- quantities, *see* vowel quantities
- quod* (thematic and restrictive) 86
- reanalysis 122–5, 189, 263, 311–14,  
 333–4
- register  
 archaisms at verse end 226, 247  
*ā*-subjunctives 277–9  
*ausim* etc. neutral in Archaic  
   Latin 195  
 cantica and senarii 8–11, 106, 125–6,  
   151, 156, 176–8, 186–7, 195, 197,  
   226, 246–7, 277, 279  
 character types 7, 178, 186–7, 226,  
   247–8
- Dinia 198 n. 19, 247–8  
 ellipsis of subject accusatives 150–2  
 Euclio 178, 196–7, 247–8  
 general 6–11  
 importance of late and Romance  
   data 154–5  
 interaction of factors 11  
*ī*-subjunctives 246–8  
 old men 278  
 present for future infinitive 154–8  
 prohibitions 106–7, 125–6  
 sigmatic futures 176–8, 186–7, 338–9  
 sigmatic infinitives 225–6  
 sigmatic subjunctives 195–8  
 tragedy 156–7, 178, 226, 279  
 typology of passages 7–8, 106–7, 126,  
   151–2, 157–8, 177–8, 197–8, 226,  
   247–8, 277–9
- relative chronology 321–7
- relative tense, *see* sequence of tenses;  
 tense and aspect
- religious language, *see* style
- rhotacism 215, 223, 315–16, 319,  
 326–7
- rhotacized forms 215–23, 353  
 after 100BC 353  
 confusion with regular forms 219,  
   221–2  
 religious language 216  
 tense and aspect of indicatives 217  
 tense and aspect of  
   subjunctives 217–22  
 verbs 215
- root aorist, *see* aorist
- Sabellic, *see* Osco-Umbrian
- sandhi* 13
- Sanskrit, *see also* Indo-Iranian  
 accentuation of verbs 188  
 conjunction reduction 136  
 injunctive 136 n. 8  
*s*-future 26 n.  
 subjunctive 308
- scansion of *cauē*, *cauē*, *cau'* 95 n. 8
- semi-deponents 41 n. 31, 323
- senarii, *see* register
- sequence of tenses, *see also* tense and  
 aspect  
 anteriority 52

- ā*-subjunctives 282–5
- backshift of tenses 53, 60–2, 88–9
- conditional clauses 78–9
- consecutive *ut* 81–3
- definition 51
- general rules 52–3
- importance of semantic factors 56–7
- ī*-subjunctives 251–2
- main clause = historic present 63–4
- main clause = non-past verb with perfect infinitive 67–70
- main clause = past tense, but primary sequence 65–7
- main clause = present perfect 64–5
- main clause = unreal subjunctive 70–77
- posteriority 52–3, 57–60, 87–8
- primary sequence 30, 53, 60–2
- pseudo-final clauses 83–6
- quod* (thematic and restrictive) 86
- rhotacized subjunctives 218, 220–2
- secondary sequence 30, 53, 60–2, 88–9
- sigmatic subjunctives 202–5
- simultaneity 52
- ut* with unreal subjunctive 79–81
- s*-future, *see also* sigmatic futures
  - Balto-Slavic 308–9
  - Celtic 308–9
  - Greek 308–9
  - Indo-Iranian 308
  - Lithuanian 26 n.
  - Old Irish 308–9
  - Osco-Umbrian 308–9, 319
  - Sanskrit 26 n.
- sigmatic aorist, *see* aorist
- sigmatic forms becoming independent of aorists 313–14
- sigmatic futures 171–90, 306–27, 338–43, 347–53; *see also s*-futures
  - after 100BC 338–42, 348–53
  - anterior meaning in subordinate clauses is secondary 189
  - causative and non-causative 180, 183–4
  - constructions of main clause *faxō* 180–2
  - decline in subordinate clauses in Terence 179
  - distribution over subordinate clause types 172–4, 179
  - fixed formulae in main clauses 187
  - no decline in main clauses in Terence 187
  - origins 306–27
  - productivity in subordinate clauses 178–80
  - reasons for restriction to first person singular in main clauses 188–9
  - register in main clauses 186–7
  - register in subordinate clauses 176–8
  - telicity in subordinate clauses 175
  - tense and aspect in main clauses 185–6
  - tense and aspect in subordinate clauses 174–6
- sigmatic infinitives 224–39, 354
  - after 100BC 354
  - co-ordination with present infinitives (future meaning) 230
  - desiderative meaning 227
  - future reference 229–30
  - glossed as Greek aorist infinitives 228
  - glossed as Latin present infinitives 228
  - parallelism with future and present infinitives 229–30
  - productivity 225
  - register 225–6
  - restriction to first-conjugation base verbs 224–5
  - tense 236–8
- sigmatic subjunctives 191–215, 306–27, 343–53
  - after 100BC 343–53
  - distribution over main clause types 210–11
  - distribution over subordinate clause types 211–12
  - inhibitive and preventive 201
  - origins 306–27
  - perfectum* 214
  - politeness in directives 201–2
  - preference for main clauses 192–3
  - productivity according to verbs 193–5

- sigmatic subjunctives (*cont.*)  
   productivity compared to regular forms 191–2  
   prohibitions 213  
   register 195–8  
   register of *ausim* etc. 195  
   register of *faxim* etc. 195–7  
   tense and aspect 199–209  
 sound changes, *see* phonological processes  
 split resolution 200 n. 30  
 statistics 15  
 style  
   accommodation 197  
   Apuleius 171, 311, 336–7  
   Cato 13  
   legal 171, 178, 188, 198, 279, 341–2  
   Livy 336  
   Pliny the Elder 232 n. 16  
   prayers / religious language 198, 216, 226, 247–8, 341, 342–3  
   tragedy 238  
   Virgil 336  
 Subject-to-Object Raising 134  
 subjunctive  
   *irrealis* meaning 70–3, 78–9  
   perfect originally non-past 97, 214–15, 250, 255–6, 260, 281–2, 287, 313–14, 372  
   Sanskrit 308  
 supine 322 n. 29  
 syncope 333–4  
 syncretism 313, 374  
 synonymy 33–4  
 telicity  
   and complements 41, 45  
   definition 138  
   influence on tense choice 139–44  
   interruption test 138  
   sigmatic futures 175  
 tense and aspect, *see also* sequence of tenses  
   absolute tense 23, 27–8, 35, 43  
   anteriority 24, 28–32, 35, 37–9, 46, 52  
   aspect in general 23–35, 37–40, 43, 46–8  
   aspect in Indo-European 26  
   completed / concluded 24, 28–32, 34–5, 37–9, 43, 46  
   difference between tense and time 199  
   double future perfect 41 n. 31  
   English future 33  
   French future 33  
   frequencies of simple future and future perfect 34, 36–7  
   future perfect 21–50  
   future perfect for inbuilt consequences 40–3  
   future perfect infinitives 227  
   infinitives, *see* Acl  
   perfective and imperfective 24–6, 29–30, 38–40, 43, 46–8  
   perfective becoming anterior 312  
   posteriority 28, 52–3, 57–60, 87–8  
   progressive 25  
   prohibitions 105  
   relative tense 24, 27–35, 37–9, 46  
   resultative future perfect 43  
   sigmatic infinitives 236–8  
   simple future 21–50  
   simultaneity 24, 28, 38, 52  
   tests 11  
   *uidere* 47  
   verbs of motion 43–7  
 textual problems 14–15  
 Tocharian *ā*-forms 306  
 tragedy, *see* style  
 Umbrian, *see also* Osco-Umbrian  
   prohibitions 97 n. 11  
 unreal subjunctive 70–3, 78–81  
*ut*  
   consecutive 81–3  
   exceptional after *faxō* 180–1  
   final and pseudo-final 83–6  
   influence on *nē*-clauses 120–1  
   origin 212  
   *potest ut* 234  
   with unreal subjunctive 79–81  
 Varro 23  
 Venetic  
   affiliation 314  
   sigmatic past 305–6, 314  
 verbal noun 141

- verb-final word order (Dutch and German) 188
- verb-second word order (Dutch and German) 188
- verb stems
  - inflectum* 21–3, 28
  - perfectum* 21–3, 28, 30–2
- Vindolanda 232, 316 n. 18
- Virgil, *see* style
- voice 148–9
  - deponents 326
  - semi-deponents 323
- voiced aspirates 307 n. 4, 323, 328–9
- voiceless -s- 315–17
- vowel lengthening
  - before -nks- 323
  - before -ns- 325
- vowel quantities 323–6
- vowel shortening
  - after light syllable 13–14
  - in final syllables 4 n. 3, 14
- ‘weaker’ 344–5